PACIFIC
Theological Seminary,

THE ART BINDERY

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/expositor-1875_1914_7

THE EXPOSITOR

EDITED BY THE REV.

SIR W. ROBERTSON NICOLL, M.A., LL.D.

EIGHTH SERIES

Volume VII

1914

HODDER AND STOUGHTON
WARWICK SQUARE, LONDON, E.C

MCMXIV

Ser. B
v. 7
1914:1

Butler & Tanner
The Selwood Printing Works
Frome and London

4739

THE EXPOSITOR

VOL. VII.

List of Contributors to Volume VII

Rev. Edwin A. Abbott, D.D.
Rev. E. H. Askwith, D.D.
Rev. Professor B. W. Bacon, D.D.
Rev. Professor W. Emery Barnes, D.D.
Right Rev. J. H. Bernard, D.D., Bishop of Ossory.
Rev. T. H. Bindley, D.D.
Rev. Professor T. Witton Davies, D.D.
Rev. G. E. Ffrench, B.D.
Rev. Principal A. E. Garvie, D.D.
T. R. Glover, M.A.
Professor Rendel Harris, Litt.D., D.D.
Rev. Maurice Jones, M.A., B.D.
Rev. Professor H. A. A. Kennedy, D.Sc., D.D.
Rev. Professor Ed. König, D.D.
Rev. Professor Kirsopp Lake, D.D.
Rev. Professor H. R. Mackintosh, D.Phil., D.D.
Rev. Professor John E. McFadyen, D.D.
Rev. Professor D. S. Margoliouth, Litt.D.
Rev. J. B. Mayor, Litt.D.
Rev. Professor Allan Menzies, D.D.
Rev. Professor James Moffatt, D.D., Litt.D.
Rev. Professor T. V. Moore, D.D.
Rev. Professor W. Morgan, D.D.
Professor A. S. Peake, D.D.
Rev. Professor C. Anderson Scott, D.D.
Rev. Professor Alex. Souter, Litt.D.
Rev. R. H. Strachan, M.A.
Rev. W. L. Walker, D.D.
Rev. T. H. Weir, M.A.
Rev. Professor Newport J. D. White, D.D.
Rev. E. W. Winstanley, D.D.

THE OLD TESTAMENT AND THE MODERN WORLD.

The interest of the Old Testament is very many-sided: it is interesting to the student of history, of literature, of ethics, of ritual, of theology, of comparative religion. But what we are now primarily concerned with is its relevance to the life of to-day. The Old Testament can hold its place in the modern world, only if it has something vital to say to that world. There can be no doubt that it once spoke home to the hearts of men; the fact that it was so carefully and lovingly preserved by the later Jewish Church is proof enough of that. The books lived because they had helped men to live. Nothing can be more certain than that God spoke to *the fathers* by the prophets; the question is, Does He still speak through them *to us*? The world in which we live and move, with its steam and electricity, its telegraph and telephone, its mammoth cities with their mansions and their slums, is as different as could be from the simple world of the Hebrew fathers; and the word spoken to them, however relevant to their life, might conceivably have little relation to us. Yet it remains true that in all the deeper things life has changed but little. "Mankind advances," as Goethe has said, "but man remains ever the same." The ancient Hebrews, like us, had their life to live, their doubts to face, their sorrows to bear, their death to die; and over the ages we can clasp their hands and call them our brethren.

We do not forget, of course, that there is a great gulf fixed between them and us—a gulf of time and circumstance;

but this gulf can be passed by serious and sympathetic study, by an intimate and accurate knowledge of the historical situation in which they were placed, and by native sympathy with them in their struggle for righteousness and their yearning after God. We have heard much of the timelessness of the Old Testament ; but its words are timeless, just because they were at first so timely. They live for ever, just because they come from the heart of living men and were addressed to a situation that was palpitating with reality. They are not, so to speak, in the air, but on the ground ; and one of the supreme tasks of the teacher or interpreter of the Old Testament is to requicken this ancient life, to reclothe the dry bones with flesh and sinew, to re-live the ancient experience which he is seeking to interpret, so that it may come home with freshness and power to the men of to-day. Being dead, those ancient men still speak to those who will take the trouble to understand their language ; and their message—not perhaps in its original form, but at any rate in its substance—is still a word of life to the very different world of to-day. Still the light that streams from the pages of Hebrew history and prophecy and poetry gives light to all that are in the house, and kindly rays fall beyond it upon those who are wandering without.

The religion of the Old Testament is, for the most part, a religion of this world. Its eyes are strained with hope and expectation towards the future, but seldom to a future beyond the grave. It is in this world that the purpose of God has to be wrought out and consummated, it is amid the historical forces of this world that the redemption of humanity is to be achieved, it is in the cities of this world that the redeemed will have their home. Here we cannot but feel a singular correspondence between the Old Testament and much that is characteristic of modern thought.

Both care supremely for the world that now is ; wherever else God may be, they both demand loudly that He be here—and the Old Testament finds Him here. The earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof, the world and they that dwell therein, and the whole earth is full of His glory. Hebrew thinkers had little or no gift for speculation, there was no danger of their losing themselves in the mazes of metaphysical discussion. The God in whom they believed was a God who moved among the facts—in the phenomena of nature, in the course of individual life, in the movements of national and international history. He was a living God. Just as men lived and moved and had their being in Him, so, in a sense, He lived and moved and had his being in them. He spoke in the noise of the thunder, in the words of the prophets, in the clash of nations. Job finds relief for his torn and desperate heart in the contemplation of the wonders of the material world—in the earth and sky and sea with all the strange and happy creatures that are therein. Robbed as he is of everything else, the world at least is left Him, and in the world is God. The Old Testament looks out upon the multitudinous facts of this world with glad and open eyes, and finds God there—in the treasures of field and vineyard, in the joys of home and country, in the march of the divine purpose across the years. We cannot be too grateful to the Old Testament for its emphasis upon the concrete realities of the world. It has something of the passion of modern science for facts. There clings to it from first to last a certain healthy materialism, the odour of this common earth ; and though this, in a sense, was the weakness of Old Testament religion, it was also its strength. So long as it cared so deeply for the things of this world, so long as it looked for and found God among the common things of daily experience, it could never sink to the level of an unreality.

There are three directions in which the Old Testament speaks with an accent that is peculiarly modern—in its treatment of the problems of the individual, of society, and of the larger world.

(i.) The individual. For centuries the religious unit was practically the nation, and consequently the problem raised for the individual by the occasional disharmony between his character and his fortunes was not keenly felt. His own life was merged, as it were, in the larger life of his tribe or nation, so that, as an individual, he hardly counted. But once those problems are raised, as they begin to be shortly before the exile, they are discussed with a fearlessness and a candour which are frequently nothing less than astonishing. Sometimes in the honest and burning words we recognise the voice of men who had temporarily drifted into scepticism and pessimism, of men who knew what it was to feel the ground rock beneath their feet ; and step by step we can sometimes trace the struggle from doubt to faith and from perplexity to peace. The views of life reflected from the pages of the Old Testament are as various as the men who hold them. Of course it is also true that the Old Testament is inspired by a splendid sense of unity. To all its writers the fear of the Lord was the beginning of all true wisdom ; one and all, they were men who looked to God and were lightened. And yet with the heavenly light in their faces and with hope in God in their hearts, they looked out upon the facts of life in very various ways. At the same time as the Chronicler was seeking to illustrate from history the truth that in this world the wicked fare badly and the righteous well, the writer of the book of Job was, in one of his moods, vehemently challenging the moral order of the world, maintaining that God destroyed the innocent and the guilty alike, that the earth was given into the hands of the wicked, and that it was the tents of

the wicked that prospered. About the same time as the pessimistic preacher was asserting that man had no pre-eminence above a beast, and throwing out the half-sceptical, half-scornful question, "Who knoweth whether the spirit of man goeth upward, and the spirit of the beast downward?" there was at least one psalmist who believed that God not only guided him in this world, but would afterwards receive him to glory; and one prophet who maintained that many who slept in the dust of the earth would awake, some to everlasting life, some to shame and everlasting contempt. There is a most refreshing and thoroughly modern variety of outlook in the Old Testament. Its writers face the facts each in his own way, and they express themselves without hesitation or disguise; they "would not make their judgment blind." The faith which they reach and hold is held in the face of all that can be said against it. They were for the most part men of sorrows and acquainted with grief, and it was out of the depths of bitter and perplexing experiences that they rose to the faith which made them steady and strong.

Most of all was their faith staggered by the misfortunes of good men and by the success of the unscrupulous. It was the very strength of their belief in God, in His power and His justice, that created for them the problem. If the earth was indeed the Lord's and the fulness thereof, to dispose of as He would, and if His will was indeed a righteous will, how came it that the good things of the world so often went to bad men and the bad things to good men? "Behold, the righteous shall be recompensed in the earth: how much more the wicked and the sinner." That was the creed, but it did not always correspond to the facts; and if God were really Sovereign, why did He not render in this world to each man according to his work?—in this world, for if not here, then not at all. There was to most of the Old Testament thinkers no outlook upon immortality, no

certainty of a judgment and a retribution beyond. If God did not justify His ways to men in this world, they could be justified nowhere. To the saints of the Old Testament seeing was believing; and, if men saw no trace of Him, they found it hard to believe in Him. The sceptics are not convinced, and the pious are not content, until they *see* something. "Let Him make speed, let Him hasten His work, that we may see it." "Let Him shew Himself." "Doubtless Thou art righteous, Jehovah," says Jeremiah, "yet there are cases that I would discuss with Thee: why does the way of the wicked prosper, and why are all those at ease that deal very treacherously?" The prophet has a deep-seated faith in the justice of God, but he is sorely perplexed by the way in which He disposes His world. So with Jeremiah's contemporary Habakkuk, and again for the reason that right seems to be trampled beneath the heels of might. "Why, O my God, dost Thou hold Thy peace, when the wicked swallows up one that is more righteous than he?" Cries such as these, wrung from bleeding hearts, shew to what a fearful strain faith was sometimes put by the facts which it had to encounter.

Two facts, in particular, contributed to render the strain upon faith all the more tense and terrible: one was the common belief that goodness must be rewarded with things material, the other was the limitation of the outlook to this life. The fundamental faith of Israel was that the man who does well must fare well, and in the deepest sense this is everlastingly true; but it was long before Israel learned to put the deepest interpretation upon it. For centuries she understood welfare to mean largely material welfare; and, as many a good man fared badly enough, nay all the worse by reason of his very fidelity to his God, faith had a sore struggle to maintain itself, and agonised cries were often lifted up to heaven. "Why standest Thou afar off, O

Lord ? " " Where," they asked, " is the God of justice ? " Belief in a future life in which the wrongs of this world might be rectified, might have soothed and quieted the heart ; but, as this belief did not dawn upon the mind of Israel till comparatively late in her development, the faithful were thrown back upon this world for the solution of the problems that vexed them, and, with so grave a limitation it can be no surprise that in all but the very greatest souls there is a sense of yearning and incompletion.

Surely all this is very modern. The thought of to-day, like that of the Old Testament, is centring very largely round this present world. The future life does not hold the place which it once held and which it ought to hold in the minds of men. There is the feeling that the world in which we live is the only world we can be sure of ; and here, if anywhere, must the justice of God be displayed, and the good man find his satisfaction and reward. These feelings are shallow enough, no doubt ; but they are widely shared, and it is here that the Old Testament can render us a very valuable service. It starts with things material, but it does not rest there ; it moves, slowly indeed, but surely, towards a faith in the world to come. The emphasis placed upon material things by the Old Testament and by the modern world is not wrong in itself—" the earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof " ; and if men were good in the Old Testament sense—just, merciful and kind—there would assuredly be a far more large and happy participation in the material blessings of this life. If the kingdom of God were sought by all first and foremost, the other things would undoubtedly be added. But the Old Testament does not rest in the material. Its greatest souls know of a satisfaction in God which nothing can shake or destroy, but which remains even when all the customary supports of faith and symbols of His presence are withdrawn. For

Though the fig-tree shall not flourish
Neither shall fruit be in the vines;
Though the labour of the olive fail,
And the fields yield no food;
Though the flock be cut off from the fold,
And there be no herd in the stalls;
Yet I will rejoice in Jehovah,
I will joy in the God of my salvation.

And again, just as the Old Testament learns to sit more loosely to material things, so it learns to look upon the life of the individual as not limited by this world. Both these moods are very clearly reflected in the seventy-third Psalm. Here is a man whose feet had almost slipped upon the weary way. He himself, for his fidelity to conscience, had been hurled to the wall, and he had been goaded by the prosperity of the unscrupulous into bitterness and scepticism: till one day it came upon him like a flash from heaven that, whatever he might lose and however he might suffer, he could not be robbed of God. He was continually with God and God with him; and the God who was with him here—he realised with a sudden throb of joy—would take him in the end to Himself and be with him for ever. In his own sublime words: "My heart and flesh fail, but God is my portion for ever." Here the writer has soared completely above the materialism which haunts most of the Old Testament into the regions of the upper air where God is all in all; and he also feels, as the Old Testament seldom does, that the fellowship begun in this world between the believer and his God will endure as long as God Himself. It is refreshing to go back behind the language of dogmatic theology to the simple and artless language of men who counted God their refuge and who could speak to Him as a man speaks to his friend.

(ii.) We have just seen how deeply and in how modern a spirit the Old Testament sympathises with the perplexities of the individual, and how these are solved by a larger

thought of God. We shall now consider briefly the message of the Old Testament to modern society. The aim of the Hebrew prophets may be described as the transformation of society, and no thinkers have ever seen more clearly or proclaimed more loudly than they that the only secure basis of society is morality and religion. The progress of the people from the simple days of the Judges to the more elaborate life of the times of the prophets had created a type of society and of social problem that in many important respects was strangely like our own. Partly through wars, whose ravages would tell more heavily upon the poor man than upon the rich, partly through the growth of cities and the rise of trade and commerce, society in the time of the prophets came to be cleft sharply into two divisions—the rich and the poor ; and already the problems had appeared which still trouble the civilisations of to-day. There was the land problem, for example, and the drink problem. There were those who joined house to house and field to field, till the poor man was crowded out, and the wealthy were left alone, as Isaiah bitterly complains, in possession of the land. There were those who crushed the people to pieces, who ground the honest faces of the poor as between the upper and the nether millstone. There were those who drank wine by the bowlful and who found the money to pay for it by defrauding the smaller man of his rights. There were those who built their palatial houses by labour for which they had not paid—houses whose stones were, so to speak, cemented with the blood of the builders, houses whose every brick and beam cried out to heaven against the luxurious despots who lived in them. There were those who took by force or by cunning the fields and houses which they coveted,—those who stripped the people to the bone ; who ate their flesh, in the fierce words of Micah, and broke their bones and chopped them in pieces as for the pot.

Such was the society which the prophets sought to reform. Yet they were in no sense social reformers, except perhaps in the very deepest sense of all, that they set themselves the task of transforming, not the institutions but the men: the transformed men could be trusted to transform the institutions for themselves. In particular they sought to create among these widely divergent classes a sense of brotherhood. The word may seldom be upon their lips, but it is the underlying thought of all their preaching. High and low, rich and poor, the people stood to their God in a common relation of worshippers and sons, and therefore they were brethren one of another. "Have we not all one father? " one of the later prophets asks, "hath not one God created us? Why then do we play one another false by profaning the covenant of our fathers? " Now there was no lack of enthusiasm for religion on the part of those who trampled upon the poor. They rendered to their God a most scrupulous service, they trod His courts with joy, they offered their burnt offerings and fat beasts, and they lifted up their hands in prayer. But the uplifted hands were red with blood, and the spoil of the poor was in the gorgeous houses from which they went to the worship of the sanctuary.

Now it is the imperishable service of the Hebrew prophets that they bound together by an indissoluble link the service of God and the service of man. This is the great truth which each proclaims in his own way, that the service for which God supremely cares is the service of the needy: inasmuch as His would-be worshippers did it not unto them, they did it not unto Him. From most of the prophets golden sayings could be quoted which shew how little they care for ritual and how much for social righteousness. They cared nothing for the fast which merely bowed a man's head like a bulrush and clothed him in sackcloth and ashes, but they did care supremely for the spirit which prompted him to loose the

heavy burden and let the oppressed go free, to deal his bread to the hungry and bring the outcasts home. To us who are so prone to put a rather remote and mystical meaning upon such a phrase as the "knowledge of God," it comes with a shock of surprise to hear Jeremiah define this knowledge as social service—in the passage where, speaking of Josiah, he says, "He judged the cause of the poor and the needy: was not this to know me, saith Jehovah?"

In this direction we have still an immense deal to learn from the Old Testament, which is a perpetual reminder that all true religion must express itself in a larger and tenderer humanity. "Seek justice, make the violent keep straight, secure the right of the orphan, undertake the cause of the widow." "Seek good," says Amos, "and ye shall live"; and the good he defines as the setting up of justice in the gate. His watchword is justice and fair play in the law courts, fair play between class and class, between man and man; his demand is that justice in this sense shall roll on and on, free and unimpeded, like the waves of the sea; and that, whatever be the political weather, righteousness, social righteousness, should roll on unintermittently like a perennial stream, which even in the fiercest heat of summer never dries up. As Amos pled in the name of his God for justice, so Hosea pleads for mercy: "I desire not sacrifice, but mercy"—that tender love to God which sweetens and hallows the relationships of men to one another, and expresses itself inevitably in love to man. The answer to that greatest of all questions, "What doth the Lord require of thee?" is expressed by the prophets in terms of social duty—to do justly and to love mercy: and the prophets see what many a modern reformer fails to see, that while every society worthy of the name must rest upon a moral basis, that basis itself is secure only if it, in its turn, rests upon the everlasting rock of religion. He alone is certain to do

justly and to love mercy continually, who is conscious, in his individual and social life, of the God above him, and who walks humbly with Him. The prophets believed in the "fundamentals," and their fundamentals were justice, mercy and God.

Quite in the spirit of the prophets do the legislators too draw up their laws for the regulation of civic life. The interests of the poor, the weak, the helpless are continually in the mind of the Hebrew legislator: over and over again the widow, the orphan, and the "stranger" are commended to the liberality of the people. The fruit of the vine and the fields and the trees was not to be too carefully gathered in, and whatever was left over was to go to the poor and the needy. The profoundly humane and sympathetic temper of the legislation comes out strikingly in the words which reinforce the command to love the stranger: "for ye also were strangers in the land of Egypt." The dignity of human nature is everywhere respected. The feelings of a female prisoner of war, to whom most nations of the ancient world would have shewn scant courtesy, are most tenderly considered; and the dignity of the poor man who has been obliged to borrow is safeguarded by the provision that his creditor shall not go into his house to fetch his pledge: he must wait outside till the pledge be brought to him. What fine and delicate feeling breathes through regulations such as these! And how considerately the need, as well as the dignity, of the working-man is respected! He is not, for example, to be kept waiting for his wage; it is to be paid him the day he earns it, before the sun goes down. The society lady who kept her dressmaker waiting twelve months for the money which is rightly hers and which should be paid as soon as the work is done, would have received short shrift from the Heblew legislators, if their authority had been as great as their devotion to the public

welfare. Provision is made to regulate the hours of labour. "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thy manservant and thy maidservant shall not do any work, but they shall rest as well as thou." If the master is entitled to his rest, no less is the man. Here again, in the phrase *they as well as thou*, so simple yet so far-reaching and profound, lies a suggestion of the fraternity which ought to subsist between members of the same social system, and which, if it did subsist, would go a long way towards solving the problems of modern society. This thought receives astonishing expression in the great speech in which Job vindicates his character against the aspersions of his friends, and which more clearly and fully than any other part of the Old Testament exhibits the Hebrew ideal of a good man. He claims, in language that would have made the heart of the prophets leap for joy, that he had delivered the poor when he cried, the fatherless also that had none to help him, and that he had caused the widow's heart to sing for joy. But he touches the loftiest height in the words, "Never did I despise the cause of my manservant or my maidservant when they contended with me. *Did not He that made me in the womb make him, and did not One fashion us in the womb?*" No Greek could have said that; one of the very greatest of them argued that the slave was but the tool of his master. But this sublime Hebrew thinker saw that the beggar sustained the same relations to God and to mother earth as did the prince—one God had made them both—so that in very truth the little man is the brother of the great man, and supercilious treatment of the poor is nothing less than blasphemy against his Maker. Enough has been said to shew how carefully the interests of the poor were considered and safeguarded; but it was clearly recognised by some at least that the ideal society was one in which there would be no poor, a society in which all the

people would eat bread without scarceness and not lack any good thing.

It is worth noting, too, how often by the prophets the blame is laid for the corruption of society at the door of the leaders of her civil, political, and religious life—the princes, the judges, the priests, the prophets. Each man, they well knew, has his own share of responsibility, but the leaders have a very special share. Leaders must have both the ability and the courage to lead: too often they were deflected from the honest pursuit of their duty by greed of gain. "The leaders judge for reward, and the priests teach for hire, and the prophets divine for money." Hebrew thinkers were peculiarly conscious of the power of money to pervert the soul; and when men in positions of power were false to their high trust, they dragged down the people with them—like priest, like people.

But the love of gain was a temptation to which not only the leaders, but the common people as well, were exposed—its roots were deep in the human heart; and very earnest are the warnings against the insidious rise of the materialistic temper. "Beware lest, when thou hast eaten and art full, and hast built goodly houses and dwelt therein, and when thy herds and thy flocks multiply, and thy silver and thy gold is multiplied, then thy heart be lifted up, and thou forget the Lord; and beware lest thou say in thine heart, 'My power and the might of my hand hath gotten me this wealth.' But thou shalt remember the Lord thy God: for He it is that giveth thee power to get wealth." When a nation begins to care more for the things she can count and weigh than for truth and goodness, she must cease to play any vital part in the progress of the world. This is a lesson peculiarly needed by the younger lands across the seas, where there is the standing temptation to measure national progress by material standards. Yet the older nations too

must keep the warning continually before them, if they would continue to contribute to the world's higher life.

There breathes through the Old Testament a great sense of the glory and obligations of nationality. The society which the prophets strove to win for God was a national society; and here again we have much to learn from Israel. No nation ever had a higher sense of mission and destiny: no nation ever had a keener appreciation of the continuity of national life, and of the reality of national responsibility. Even when Jehovah was felt to be the God of the whole world, He still remained in a peculiar sense—what He had been from the exodus to the exile—the national God of Israel. To us a national God may seem a poor and limited God, but the very limitation was a source of strength. It is a great thing for a nation to have a God in whom, as a nation, it believes; a God with a purpose to which, as a nation, it strives deliberately to contribute. Despised and rejected as she was, Israel knew herself to be the servant of the Lord with a great world-mission to fulfil. And if the nations of the modern world had the same appreciation as Israel had of the great purpose that is being wrought out in history, and if each could regard herself, like Israel, as in some sense the servant of that purpose and were willing to bend her energies to the fulfilling of the same, the animosities of rival nations would for ever vanish and each would vie with the other only in rendering the noblest service to humanity.

(iii.) Now that we have considered the Old Testament treatment of the individual and of society, especially in its national form, let us consider briefly its attitude to international relations and to the larger world. It must be frankly confessed that the interest of the average Jew was restricted to his own people, and that he frequently thought of other nations with hostility, regarding them as enemies

of the Kingdom of God. His brethren were the Jews, not the men of other lands. The context of the great command "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself" puts it beyond all doubt that the neighbour is a fellow-Jew. Even when thought takes a nobler flight forward to the days when all the world shall be bound together by the common worship of the great God, Jerusalem is still thought of as the great religious metropolis, the centre and capital of the world. The Old Testament never quite reaches the point at which it could say, "Neither in this mountain nor yet in Jerusalem shall ye worship the Father." A tinge of national particularism colours its most catholic and comprehensive dreams.

Yet some of the nobler spirits come very near transcending these national limitations. Some, especially of the later books of the Old Testament, have little or nothing that is specifically Jewish about them at all: they breathe the spirit of the great world. The wisdom of the book of Proverbs is a large human wisdom: the problem faced by the book of Job is a great human problem, not Israel's any more than ours; the pessimism of the book of Ecclesiastes is the voice of the weary souls of a hundred lands. Despite their profound sense of separation, the Jews, or some of them at least, were coming to feel their kinship with the larger world. What is the book of Ruth, for example, but a noble plea for the alien? It was probably written at a time when stern measures were being taken for the dissolution of the marriages of Hebrews with foreign women, who were regarded as a menace to the purity of Hebrew religion; and here is a deep-hearted Hebrew, who is not afraid to look upon a Moabite woman as his sister, and as an Israelite indeed. What is the book of Jonah, but an eloquent protest against the narrow idea that God cared for Israel only—a plea for a love which stretches beyond the borders

of Israel and covers the whole world ? It is still true that Israel holds a unique place : it is by her men and her message that the world is to be brought to the knowledge of Jehovah, it is to her God that the ends of the earth have to look in order to be saved. Still the middle wall of partition is beginning to be broken down, and there slowly dawns the vision of a day when nations that once hated and feared and fought each other shall lay aside their ancient rivalries and band themselves together gladly in the cause of peace and in the worship of the living God. "In that day there shall be a highway out of Egypt to Assyria, and the Assyrian shall come into Egypt, and the Egyptian into Assyria; and the Egyptians shall worship with the Assyrians."

Most wonderful and modern of all is the great vision, repeated twice in prophecy, of the days when the nations that were wont to settle their quarrels by the sword, deliberately resolve to go to Zion as the world's great seat of justice, to submit their cases to arbitration. "Many nations shall go and say, Come and let us go up to the mountain of Jehovah, and He will teach us of His ways : for out of Zion shall go forth instruction, and the word of Jehovah from Jerusalem; and He will judge between the nations and decide concerning the peoples" : and so reasonable and satisfactory is the decision that the armed men go away content, with thoughts of war in their heart no more, but resolved to beat their swords into ploughshares and their spears into pruninghooks, so that, in transforming their weapons, they transform themselves and the world. Here surely, in this dream of an ancient seer, lies the real solution of the war-problem which presses to-day so heavily upon the hearts of all true lovers of humanity—that the nations shall be willing to submit their disputes to a court which they can trust, because it is the embodiment of even-

handed justice, and that they shall be willing to abide by the decision which that court has pronounced. This prophecy is almost a description, in so many words, of what actually took place a little over three years ago at the Hague, where a century-old dispute between Great Britain and the United States was finally settled, and a great menace to the harmony, if not to the peace, of those nations was for ever removed. The President of the Tribunal used very striking words to characterise the epoch-making importance of the decision. "And now," he said, "these two nations, to which the world is indebted for so much of its progress in every sphere of human thought and action, have agreed to submit their long-standing conflict to the arbitration of this tribunal. . . . In so doing, these governments have set an example to the whole community of nations and have acquired a new merit in the sublime cause of international justice and peace." I simply quote these words to shew how modern the Old Testament is, how full of practical wisdom, how much it may still be our guide as well as our inspiration in the complex world of to-day.

Thus, whether in its treatment of the problems of the individual, of society, or of the great world, the Old Testament speaks to us words of deep wisdom and of broad humanity, which are as true and as potent to-day as when first they were spoken. And because it believes so profoundly in a God whose purpose in history must be ultimately triumphant—"for Jehovah of hosts hath purposed, and who shall annul it?"—its final word is a word of hope. It is always looking beyond the days that now are to the days that shall be: it is always holding before the disappointed eyes of men the fairer future that is to be the issue of the present: it is always saying, "It shall come to pass in the latter days." One prophet conceives the future in this way, and another in that; but all are agreed that there will come

a yet more glorious day. Beyond the social and political confusions of the present they see the new Jerusalem descending out of heaven from God.

JOHN E. MCFADYEN.

THE WORDS "WITCH" AND "WITCHCRAFT": THEIR PROPER AND IMPROPER USE IN HISTORY AND LITERATURE.[1]

No one can have read with intelligence and care writings dealing with Magic and allied phenomena without being impressed with the loose and careless way in which the words "witch" and "witchcraft" have been employed. We have a capital instance of this in the A.V. and other older English versions of the Bible in which we read of "witches" and of "witchcraft," though the ideas which the majority of people connect with these terms were unknown to Bible writers and indeed wholly unknown in Bible times. Misled by our translators, commentators on the Bible and writers on theological and allied subjects have said much which we, with our fuller and more accurate information, know to be incorrect. It is the aim of this paper to show the origin of the confusion and to make suggestions with a view to greater accuracy in the employment of these and related terms.

The word "witch" seems to note etymologically one who knows. It is derived from the A.S. "wicca," which, though strictly masculine, came very early to be used of the male and female irrespective of sex. For a long time the English word "witch" stood for a male rather than a female. In Wycliff's (d. 1384) translation of Acts viii. 9 Simon Magus is called a "witch." In the "Vision of Piers

[1] Paper read at the International Congress of the Science of History, London, April 4, 1913.

Plowman" by Langland (d. 1400) we have the words "he was a witch" (xvi. 69). In Malory's *Mort d'Arthur* it will be remembered that Merlin is called a "witch." There are many examples of this usage in the writings of Shakespeare. See *Cym.* I. 6, l. 166, "He is . . . a witch." The masculine sense of witch exists still in spoken English. In a small hut by the sea, two miles to the South of Criccieth N.W., there lives a long-haired, haggard old man whom the people about speak of as a "witch": I heard him so called last week (March 30, 1913). The word wizard is commonly regarded as the masculine of "witch," and it is so given in grammars; it has, however, not only no etymological connexion with the latter, but it comes from a different language, i.e., from the French "guisart." Since the thirteenth century the term "witch" has come to be used more and more exclusively of a woman, and in particular of such a woman as is supposed to have sold her soul to the devil on condition of receiving in return supernatural power over living beings and property. It is of such a person that the modern mind thinks when the word "witch" is mentioned. In his *Discoverie of Witchcraft* (1584) Reginald Scot (d. 1599) says: "Witches are women who be commonly old, lame, blear-eyed, pale, full of wrinkles . . . so as what mischief, mischance or calamities or slaughter is brought to pass they are easily persuaded the same is done by themselves." In John Wilson and Thomas Bagnell's *Complete Christian Dictionary*, 7th edition, 1661, a work of great learning for its day, there is a long article on "Witch and Witchcraft," in the course of which we are told that the word "witch" denotes, besides other things, "a woman who exerciseth devilish arts such as be named in Deuteronomy xviii. 10; Leviticus xix. 26; Exodus xxii. 18." The present writer pleads that as this sense of "witch" is commonest in English literature it is the

one that should be always followed, so that misunderstanding may be avoided. Unfortunately a goodly number of English writers of eminence follow the example set by the authors of the A.V. of the English Bible and use "witch" in the sense of "sorceress" or "female magician," i.e., they give the word "witch" the sense of a female agent who practises the magical art. This, as I think, inaccurate employment of the word arises for the most part from the lack of words with distinct connotation in our language. In this respect we are at a great disadvantage as compared with the Germans, for they have two separate terms for male and female magician (sorcerer and sorceress), viz., *Zauberer* and *Zauberin*. And in addition there is in the same language a word of unambiguous meaning equivalent to our "witch" in the sense the word bears in the old English writers just quoted, i.e. *Hexe*. I am not speaking of the etymology or history of the German words mentioned, I am dealing merely with their conventional meaning in modern German literature. The French language is not much richer than our own in separate unambiguous words corresponding to the German *Zauberer*, *Zauberin* and *Hexe*. For the first the French use *sorcier*; for the second and third one word is made to do duty, viz., *sorcière*. In Old French, however, one meets with "devine" (or "deoyne") in the sense of the German *Hexe* and the English "witch." This word occurs, spelt "devyne," in "Le Mistère du Vieux Testament," where the so-called "witch of Endor" is thus designated. The French language has the advantage of our own in that it has a masculine and a feminine form corresponding to our magician, viz., *magicien*, f. *magicienne*. The English word was, in Old English, sometimes of common gender. We, of course, have sorcerer and sorceress: but sorcery is strictly divination—divining by lots (sortilage)—not magic, and there-

fore the sorcerer is a diviner, not a magician. The second meaning, "magician," came, however, in time to be attached to the word. It is no doubt owing to the poverty of the English language in the respect named that "witch" has come to be used largely by excellent scholars and writers in the sense of a female magician or a sorceress as well as in the sense which, in my opinion, properly belongs to it.

That the revisers of our English Bible in 1884 were of opinion that the word "witch" has no proper place in our Bible is proved by the fact that in the only two instances of its occurrence in the A.V. they substitute for it "sorceress" in the one case and "sorcerer" in the other. It will be shown further on that they did not carry out fully the process of revising by excluding also words of cognate origin ("witchcraft," etc.). The two passages in which the A.V. contains the word "witch" are Exodus xxii. 18 and Deuteronomy xviii. 11. The first verse is translated in the A.V. thus: "Thou shalt not suffer a witch (R.V. 'sorceress') to live." In the second passage the "witch" (R.V. "sorcerer") appears in a long list of classes of persons with whom the worshipper of Yahwe is to have no dealings. The Hebrew word is in both cases the active participle of the verb כִּשֵּׁף (*Kishshēph*), properly כַּשֵּׁף (*Kashshēph*), which is identical with the Assyrian verb *Kashapu*, to practise magic, strictly, according to Langdon, by the use of spittle. But in Exodus xxii. 18 the participle is feminine מְכַשֵּׁפָה (pausal form of מְכַשֵּׁפָה), a sorceress. In the Deuteronomy (xviii. 11) passage we have a masculine participle (מְכַשֵּׁף) which in the A.V. is nevertheless translated "witch," but which the Revisers translated "sorceress," showing that even in 1611 this word could be treated as masculine as well as feminine. No scholar, however, will have much doubt that the Hebrew words denote in the one case a female and in the other a male magician. It is not abso-

lutely certain that the so-called feminine ending in מְכַשֵּׁפָה has reference to gender. It may be the ending denoting the so-called noun of unity—one agent of the kind intended (cf. כֹּהֶלֶת), or it may be the ending implying the plural such as is common in Arabic, Hebrew, etc. That the use of "witch" in the A.V. has led to a misunderstanding of these passages and also of the superstitions by which the Hebrews were surrounded, and to which they often yielded, is proved by an examination of commentaries and other theological works. Let me give one example from the *Complete Christian Dictionary* of John Wilson and Thomas Bagnell already cited. In the article "Witch," the authors quote Exodus xxii. 18, "Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live," and add: "By witch is here meant any one that hath any dealings with the devil, by any compact or confederacy whatever." I should like to know how many sermons have been preached which have blundered in the same way and for the same reason.

The expression "the witch of Endor" occurs frequently in literature and especially in common parlance, but it is not found in the English Bible. In 1 Samuel xxviii., where alone this character is spoken of, the Hebrew words אֵשֶׁת בַּעֲלַת אוֹב are translated in the A.V. and the R.V. "a woman that hath a familiar spirit." A literal rendering would be "a woman who is mistress of an ōb" or "ghost"; i.e. one able to compel a departed spirit to return in order to answer certain questions. This woman was therefore a necromancer, a species of diviner. We do sometimes think of a witch as telling fortunes but hardly as calling back the dead to reveal the secrets of the spiritual world. We have in Babylonian a similar phrase *mushêlû ékimmu*="he who calls up spirits from the dead"; i.e., in German, *Totenbeschwörer:* so Alfred Jeremias, *Das Alte Testament im Lichte des Alten Orients*,[2] p. 491[2] note 2, Eng.

ed. II. 184, note 2. It is significant that the English translator of this German work (C. L. Beaumont) renders the German *Totenbeschwörer* by "sorcerer or witch," both of which are inaccurate translations. We meet with necromancy also among the Egyptians: see Budge, *Egyptian Magic*, p. 23.

The word "witchcraft" occurs thrice in the A.V. of the English Bible. In 1 Samuel xv. 23 "the sin of witchcraft" (A.V. and R.V.) should be as in the R.V.m., "the sin of divination," the last word representing the Hebrew קֶסֶם, *qesem*, the commonest Biblical word for divination. The phrase "used witchcraft" (2 Chron. xxxiii. 6 of King Manasseh) is correctly rendered in the R.V. "practised sorcery," the Hebrew verb (כִּשֵּׁף *kishshēph*) being that whence the participles in Exodus xxii. 18 and Deuteronomy xviii. 11 translated "witch" in the A.V. are derived. The cognate Assyrian verb *kashapu* is that generally used for practising black magic. The word translated in the A.V. "witchcrafts" in Galatians v. 20 (*φαρμακεία*, *pharmakeia*) is the ordinary Greek term for magic or sorcery, and it is rightly translated by the latter (sorcery) in the R.V. It denotes, however, literally "the act of administering drugs" and later "magical potions." It came naturally to stand for the magician's art, as in the present passage and as also in Wisdom xii. 4, xviii. 13, and in the LXX of Isaiah xlvii. 9, where it represents the Hebrew plural noun כְּשָׁפִים (*kᵉshaphim*), translated "sorceries": cf. the cognate verb כִּשֵּׁף (*kishshēph*), Assyr. *kashapu*, already considered more than once. The plural "witchcrafts" (in A.V. and R.V.) stands for the Hebrew noun just mentioned כְּשָׁפִים in 2 Kings ix. 22, Micah v. 12 and Nahum iii. 4, but in all these passages a proper rendering would be "sorceries" or "magical arts." "Witchcrafts" is inaccurate and misleading.

The verb "bewitch" occurs in Acts viii. 9, 11 A.V. (of Simon Magus *bewitching* the people) and in Galatians iii. 1 A.V. and R.V. ("O foolish Galatians, who hath *bewitched* you?"). In the first passage the Greek verb is ἐξίστημι (*existīmi*), which is properly rendered by the revisers "amazed"; in verse 13 the passive of the same verb is translated "he was amazed" (A.V. "he wondered"). In Galatians iii. 1 the verb is βοσκαίνω (*boskainō*), which is used of the blinding effect of the evil eye and has perhaps an occult reference, but it has nothing whatever to do with "witchcraft" as ordinarily understood.

Babylonian-Assyrian Words.

The two principal Babylonian-Assyrian verbs for describing the art of practising magic are (1) *kashapū*, which has been noticed, and (2) *ashīpū*.

From the first verb we get the nouns *kashshapu*, a male magician or sorcerer, and *kashshaptu*, a female magician or sorceress. The masculine form is represented in the Hebrew Bible in the form כַּשָּׁף (*kashshāf* in Jeremiah xxvii. 9, the only place where it occurs, and it is there plural, כַּשָּׁפִים, translated in the EVV (A.V. and R.V.) "sorcerers." Of the methods adopted by the *kashshapu* we know little: but this much we do know. (1) That it means to put under a magical spell, i.e. that it denotes using black magic, the magic that injures or destroys. (2) That in this kind of magic spittle was used, though how we do not know. I have elsewhere ("Magic," etc., p. 48 *Encyc. Bibl.* vol. i. 1116) defended the view of Fleischer that the root in *kashapu*, Hebrew, כָּשַׁף, means to look dark, gloomy, cf. Arabic كسف *kasafa*, to be eclipsed, of the sun, moon, etc. Then to be distressed, and finally to seek relief by occult means. But this last meaning, which is what we want, is somewhat far removed from the Arabic verb كسف *kasafa*, from which

Fleischer argues, though this verb does mean to frown, look angry.

German scholars almost invariably represent *kashshaptu* and *ashiptu* by *Zauberin*, not by *Hexe*, though there are some exceptions. If the Assyrian *kashshapu* means a magician, *kashshaptu*, the feminine form, can only mean a female magician or sorceress, and it is certainly misleading if not incorrect to translate it by "witch," as is commonly done by good Assyriologists, as Sayce, Jastrow, C. H. W. Johns and W. R. Rogers. Those who like Marett (*Anthrop.* 202, 299) identify witchcraft with black magic have some justification for rendering *kashshapu* and *kashshaptū* by "wizard" and "witch," the English equivalents of this and similar words adopted by R. Campbell Thompson in his *Semitic Magic* (1908), p. xxiv. *et passim*. He (Marett) speaks also of *wizardry* and *witchcraft*, a useful distinction if we accept his nomenclature, which I at least do not for reasons to be immediately stated.

2. We have another pair of Babylonian-Assyrian nouns, *ashshipu*, f. *ashshiptu* (often spelt as the verb with one "š" or "sh"), but these are used in connexion with *white* magic even more than in connexion with the *black* species. In a good sense the words denote one who uses countermagic, in German a *Gegenzaubererer*, a *Beschwörer* (exorcist), one who casts out devils, who neutralises the evil working of evil spirits. This functionary is in reality a kind of priest whose rôle it is to exert influence upon the good gods or benevolent spirits, by prayer and other means, against the demons or malevolent spirits. But the same nouns are used also of persons who practise the black art, i.e. *ashshipū* and *ashshiptu*, besides being employed in the above favourable senses, are also used as the equivalents of *kashshapu* and *kashshaptu*. Whatever justification there may be for translating *kashshaptu* by "witch" does not

apply to the term *ashshiptu*, which means often a priestess.[1] The cognate Hebrew אַשָּׁף (ashshāf), found only in Daniel, the Hebrew (i. 20 and ii. 2) and (modified) in the Aram. (ii. 10, etc.) parts, seem to mean an exorcist, one that practises countermagic (*Gegenzauberer*), see *Magic, Divination, Demonology among the Hebrews*, etc., by the present writer, p. 83. There are other Babylonian-Assyrian words which are sometimes Englished by "witch," such as *elinitu*, female magician, sorceress (*elinu* = high), and *Nertanītū*, a woman that casts a spell, a *nertu*, on a person.

In his invaluable books on (1) *Religion of Babylon and Assyria*, 1898, and (2) *Religious Beliefs in Babylonia and Assyria*, 1911, the whole published in a revised form in one German work, Jastrow couples "sorcerers" and "witches" so frequently that he leaves no doubt of his intention to regard "witch" as synonymous with "female magician" or sorceress (Ger. *Zauberin*, Fr. *magicienne*), just as is done in the A.V. of Exodus xxii. 18. See the first work mentioned, p. 267 ff., and the second, pp. 91, 304 (bottom line), 305 (lines 2, 7 ff.), 314 (line 7), 316 (line 13), etc. Both he (second work, p. 391) and Johns (*Babylonian and Assyrian Laws*, etc., 1904, p. 44) call the crime condemned in the Khammurabi Code, § 1 f., "witchcraft." But in this code the agent is a male (*awilum* or *avilum*) and the crime that of casting a spell. It is possible, of course, that *Awilum* has, like the Hebrew אָדָם (*adam*), the Greek *ἄνθρωπος* and the Latin *homo*, the generic sense human being, but even then it cannot denote a female agent exclusively, and *witchcraft* is not the word to describe the crime in question, though our word "bewitch" is, it must be admitted, a wonderfully convenient verb for the German *Bezaubern*, the Hebrew כְּשֵׁף and the Babylonian *kashapu*.

[1] Jastrow (Hastings' *Dict. Bible*, v. 555) says: "Ashipu was a priest who had charge of the exorcising rites."

Marett (*Anthropology*, 202, 210 f.) identifies witchcraft with Black Magic, making it consist (202) "in trafficking, or at any rate in being supposed to traffic, with powers of evil for sinister and anti-social ends." But note in reply (1) In witchcraft the agent is, properly speaking, a woman. (2) Both black and white magic are strictly magic and have the same underlying assumptions, those of magic, not those of witchcraft. Indeed, as previously pointed out, the Babylonian verb and noun *ashshipū* has reference to both kinds of magic. (3) One species of magic may be called "cosmic" or "impersonal," for it proceeds in total ignorance or forgetfulness of spiritual beings, gods, demons or ghosts. This cosmic or impersonal magic is of the black as well as of the white kind: but at least black cosmic magic is not witchcraft, even if black personal magic is. It is therefore impossible to equate "black magic" and "witchcraft."

The late Sir A. Lyall (*Asiatic Studies*, I. ch. iv. p. 99 ff.) handles the word witchcraft very loosely, for he uses it interchangeably with sorcery (magic) just as he substitutes witch for sorcerer and *vice versa*, without being conscious of any difference. He then proceeds to say what he means by witchcraft, distinguishing it from religion thus: In the latter we seek, he says, to influence deity by prayer and gifts. Our success depends largely on right words rightly used and appropriate gifts properly offered. Most thinkers would say that this embraces a good deal of what is known as magic. It would include a full half and more of what the Babylonians meant by *ashshipu*.

In witchcraft Lyall says man acts on his own. No longer recognising the existence of spiritual beings, gods, demons or ghosts, he follows a rough and ready logic of *post hoc ergo propter hoc*. In other words, he identifies witchcraft with that half of magic which may be called

impersonal or cosmic. He defines a witch "as one" (male or female) "who professes to work marvels, not through the aid and counsel of the supernatural beings in whom he believes as much as the rest, but by certain occult faculties and devices which he conceives himself to possess." Now first of all, a witch in modern English is a woman. Then witchcraft surely in all cases takes note of spiritual beings —evil ones with whom alliances are made to secure the ends desired. The divergent definitions of witchcraft which have been given—and others could be added—prove surely the need for some understanding on the matter among anthropologists and historians of human culture.

T. Witton Davies.

DAVID'S "CAPTURE" OF THE JEBUSITE "CITADEL" OF ZION (2 Sam. v. 6–9).

I take as the title of this paper the description which is commonly given of the contents of a very difficult passage. How great are the difficulties which beset the text of 2 Samuel v. 6–9 is well set forth in the new edition of Dr. Driver's *Notes*. Whether anything like a complete explanation of the passage is possible I will not undertake to say. But a fresh consideration of these four verses in connexion with their context does suggest that some of the chief difficulties arise from a misconception of the nature of the event which is here recorded. Was that event the capture of an almost impregnable citadel? Was it a great military exploit?

Certainly the Chronicler so understood it. In the parallel passage (1 Chron. xi. 4–7) "Jebus" or "the stronghold of Zion" is captured by a forlorn hope. David brings "all Israel" against the city; he calls for a volunteer to lead

the assault, promising a reward; Joab accepts the challenge, goes up first, and wins the reward. "And David said, Whosoever smiteth the Jebusites first *shall be chief and captain.* And Joab, the son of Zeruiah, *went up first*, and was made chief." Here then in Chronicles is the account of the gallant storming of a hill-fortress.

When, however, we turn back to 2 Samuel we find missing just the three phrases which suggest an important and daring military operation. David goes to Jerusalem with "his men" only, his bodyguard, not with "all Israel." No reward is offered to anybody for making his way into "the hold," and above all no one "goes up" (except in the faulty translation of the English versions). Moreover, as if to assure us on this last point, it is written a few verses later (ver. 17) that David *went down* into the hold. It is reasonable to suppose that the same "hold" or "stronghold" is meant in all three verses, 7, 9, and 17, for the Hebrew word is the same in the three passages.

But if "the hold" (הַמְּצוּדָה) were not a citadel, can any suggestion be made as to its nature? Surely yes! During the excavation of Gezer in the winter of 1907–8 Mr. R. A. S. Macalister found a large tunnel starting in the midst of the city and ending in a cave in which rose a great spring of water. The tunnel, reached by a downward flight of 80 steps, measured on an average 23 feet by 12 feet 10 inches. I venture to maintain that the whole locality (tunnel, cave, and spring) would have been described by the author of the books of Samuel as מְצוּדָה, "a hold."

If the word be indeed derived from the well known root צוד "to hunt," its primary local meaning will be "a hunter's lurking place," a covert in which he may lie hid and watch for his quarry. Such a locality might or might not be a *cave* (מְעָרָה), and it certainly would not be of necessity situated on the top of a commanding hill. Some secret

spot overlooking a spring or stream at which wild things drink would be an ideal "hold."

Such a place would have other uses, and in particular it might serve as a hiding-place for a man in flight before his enemies. So at the beginning of Psalm xci. the Psalmist speaks of the safety of him who dwells *in the secret place* (בסתר) of the most High ,and then proceeds, "I will say of JEHOVAH, He is my refuge and my strong hold [1] (מצודתי)." Surely the thought is of a natural hiding-place, *strong* because it is concealed and so difficult of access. There is at least nothing to suggest a citadel set on a hill.

Again, in 1 Samuel xxii. 1, 4, 5 (*pace* Wellhausen and Budde who emend the text) that which is at first described as the "cave of Adullam" is afterwards spoken of as "the hold." Budde (*in loco*) evidently thinks that a fortified town would be a more appropriate place of refuge for David and his 400 men than a "cave," but such a consideration has a modern stamp upon it and affords very unsafe ground for altering the text. External testimony (LXX B and Lucian, Peshitta and Targum) confirms the Massoretic reading. The change of wording admits an easy explanation. The "hold" was a tangle of hill and forest, the centre of which, the "cave [2] of Adullam," served as David's headquarters. It was "strong" because the outlaws knew every step of it, and perhaps because they had artificially strengthened some of its natural defences. The Boers harassed the British from such "strongholds" during the war of 1899–1902.

Again, we may surely appeal to the usage of the plural form מְצָדוֹת, "holds" or "strongholds," which is found in Judges and Samuel.[3] It is irregular in form, but there can

[1] Not "fortress," as R.V. gives inconsistently.

[2] Or "caves." The word is used as a collective in 1 Kings xviii. 4, 13.

[3] The plural form מְצוּדוֹת is found only in Ps. xxxi. 3.

be no reasonable doubt that it is *de facto* the plural of מצודה, and that it is used in the same sense. But the usage of this form forbids us to adopt the translation "citadel" or "fortress." In 1 Samuel xxiii. 14, 19, 29 מְצָדוֹת, "holds" or "strongholds" are *contrasted* with "a town that hath gates and bars" (ver. 7). So again in Judges vi. 2 "strongholds" are mentioned along with mountain "dens" and "caves," in which the Israelites took refuge for fear of the Midianites.

If now we consider the meaning of 2 Samuel v. 6–9, being previously fortified by a study of the use of מצודה (מצדות), "stronghold," in Judges and Samuel, we shall be prepared to find in "the stronghold of Zion" not a castle or tower which openly dominated the surrounding country, but a secret natural refuge which a remnant of the old population of Canaan maintained for a reason to be shortly suggested. This result is of great importance for the topography of ancient Jerusalem. The later "city of David" was built on the site of the "stronghold of Zion," for David took up his abode in "the hold" and built round it the city which was afterwards called by his name (*vv.* 7, 9). The language of the passage reminds us of the conditions which the excavations at Gezer have revealed. Macalister found "waste and in the middle of a crowded city," and on further digging struck upon the tunnel, the cave, and the water spring—the "stronghold," let us call it—round which the later builders erected their massive city walls.

Into such a stronghold David and his men disappeared, no doubt, when the Philistines came up "to seek him" (ver. 17). The text of this verse has arrested the attention of commentators, for it reads, "David . . . *went down* to[1] the hold": *κατέβη εἰς τὴν περιοχήν* (LXX B). It has been suggested, e.g., by Budde (*in loco*) that David "went

[1] The preposition may be rendered equally well "into."

down" from Zion to Adullam (1 Sam. xxii. 1, 4, 5), but this is unlikely, since the "hold" naturally refers back to the "Hold of Zion" mentioned only eight and ten verses earlier in the same chapter. Neither would the suggestion give any real help, if it were adopted. The sequel tells that David fell upon the Philistines in the valley of Rephaim, immediately to the south of Jerusalem. Now whether Adullam was within striking distance of the Plain of Rephaim we do not know, whereas it is certain that David could surprise the enemy from Zion by a night march of little more than an hour. David then "*went down* into the hold of Zion"; and the "hold" was a hiding-place and not a commanding citadel.

If this be so, the main objection to identifying the southern spur of the Eastern Hill with the site of the original "city of David" is removed. "The spur in question," writes C. R. Conder,[1] in arguing against the identification, "presents an area of only a few acres, the crest being lower than the summit of the other hills, and unfitted for the erection of a *citadel*."[2] But who said that there was any "citadel" of the Jebusites on Zion? Certainly not the author of Samuel. It is equally of course beside the mark when Conder points out that the south-western hill (which indeed has been called Zion from the fourth century of our era) "commanded the whole town, and was indeed the only hill on which a strong military situation could be found."[3] "A strong military situation" was not necessarily the most appropriate site for a "hold."

In 2 Samuel v. 6–9 there is no reference to a "citadel," and no description of the storming of a height. The important feature of the narrative is a parley between the Jebu

[1] Hastings, *D. B.*, "Jerusalem" (page 591).
[2] Italics my own.
[3] Hastings, as above.

sites and David. Of fighting nothing is said, unless the simple words, "*And* David took the hold of Zion" necessarily imply an armed struggle.[1] (The "Nevertheless" of A.V., R.V. is simply misleading.) The narrative states that the Jebusites said, "Thou shalt not come in," *so* David simply took the hold and came in. There is no word in the Hebrew to suggest a great military exploit.

It may of course be conceded that the Chronicler believed the "hold of Zion" to have been a genuine citadel such as existed in his own day. By the end of the fourth century B.C. Jerusalem had a history of some centuries behind her as the City of the great King. Both Eastern and Western hills were well covered with houses or with the ruins of former buildings, and the Chronicler could think of Zion only as a part of a city which was the centre of the civilised life of Israel. A Zion of rock and forest concealing a natural place of refuge was for him unthinkable, but it is the picture suggested by the author of Samuel.

This discussion of the hold and of its capture might stop at this point, for we cannot proceed further without some emendation of the text. But it will no doubt be asked, What alternative view of the meaning of 2 Samuel v. 6–9 has the writer to offer? It is hoped that the close translation from the Hebrew which follows (together with some emendations and comments) will supply a sufficient answer. This translation, in spite of the emendations adopted, keeps at least as closely to the Massoretic text as does the Authorised Version. The passage is manifestly corrupt, and the only choice is between one emended form and another.

2 Samuel v. 6–9.

6. And the king and his men went to Jerusalem to the

[1] Contrast the wording of 2 Samuel xii. 27, 29. "I have fought and I have taken"—"David fought against it and took it." See also 1 Kings x. 16; 2 Kings xii. 17.

Jebusite, the inhabitant of the land, and one[1] gave command concerning David to say :—

"Thou shalt not come in hither,
But [the Baal][2] of the blind and the lame
Hath turned thee away, saying,
David shall not come in hither."

7. So David took the hold of Zion : that is the city of David.

8. And David said on that day :—

"Every one who smiteth a Jebusite
And toucheth the *tsinnor*[3]
{Is hated of David's soul.
{But the blind and the lame[4]
[Ye shall take alive,][5]

The reference is to the elders of the Jebusites assembled in council, or else directly to the priest who gave the oracle which follows.

[2] The grammar demands some emendation here. The verb is in the singular, but the apparent subject ("the blind and the lame") is in the plural. The Septuagint (ἀντέστησαν) makes the verb plural, while R.V. marg. goes one step further and imagines the plural of an imperfect (future) tense, "the blind and the lame shall turn thee away." The merit of the proposal to read "Baal" here is that if it be adopted it explains the disturbance of the text. "Baal" was removed in accordance with Hosea ii. 16, 17. The mutilation of the name of Saul's son from Esh-*baal*, "man of Baal" (1 Chron. viii. 33) to Ish-*bosheth*, "man of shame" (2 Sam. ii. 8) will occur to students. It is quite possible that the Massoretes in refusing to point the verb as a plural were preserving a hint of a tradition that *Bosheth*, "shame," was to be read here.

[3] For the construction (a participle followed by a finite verb), see Gesenius-Kautzsch, § 116*x*.

[4] The transposition of these two clauses is undoubtedly a bold emendation. It may, however, be defended on three considerations : (*a*) some words are needed to complete the sense of the two preceding clauses; (*b*) the participle "hated of David's soul" (שנאוי) is corrupt and may be as easily emended into the singular (שנוא) as into the plural ; (*c*) we can give an excellent reason for the disturbance of the text, if it stood originally as proposed above. The slight change, consisting of the transposition of the words "lame" and "blind" to agree with ver. 8, is supported by the Peshitta, but need not be pressed ; but if it be accepted, it makes the supposed omission of the following clause by *homœoteleuton* somewhat more probable (הפסחים תתפשו חיים or חיים).

[5] It is necessary to supply *some* verb to govern the accusative which is expressed in the phrase "the blind and the lame." R.V. supplies "smite," but "take alive" constitutes a more noteworthy saying.

Seeing that [1] they say,
Even the blind and the lame,
He shall not come into the House." [2]

9. And David dwelt in the hold, and called it the City of David. And David built round about from Millo and inward.

According to this emended text the story of 2 Samuel v. 6–9 may be told as follows. In 2 Samuel v. 5 it is said that David reigned for thirty-three years in Jerusalem over all Israel. Ver. 6 explains the circumstances under which this reign began. David moved northward with his men to Jerusalem, a more central spot than Hebron for his government. But he was guided by other considerations beside geographical ones. The Jebusites as the ancient inhabitants held the ancient sanctuary of Zion. To this house of a god David as a new king wished to be admitted and to receive by this admission an acknowledgment of his kingship. So did Alexander the Great on his march southward after the battle of Issus in 333 B.C. demand entrance into Tyre that he might offer sacrifice to Melcart. Alexander was refused admission, and so was David. The Jebusites quoted an oracle of their god forbidding his entrance. The king came for recognition and received a blank refusal.

But who, it may be asked, are " the blind and the lame " ? A Jewish scholar, K. Kohler, thinks that the guardian spirits of the hold are meant.[3] More probably human ministers of the god are intended. The word " blind " may be a mocking substitution in the Hebrew text for " Seers," and " lame " may be a distortion of the name of the dancing

[1] כִּי עַל כֵּן is to be translated here (as in Ps. xlv. [2]) " seeing that " ; cf. Gen. xviii. 5 (כִּי עַל כֵּן).

[2] The House, i.e., the sanctuary of the god of the Jebusites ; cf. 2 Kings x. 21, 23, 26, 27.

[3] He proposes עִוְרִים, " watchers," and פִּסְּחִים, " those who leap over the threshold." *A.J.Th.* i. 803.

priests.[1] The guardians of the Jebusite sanctuary claimed (I suppose) to be seers, and practised religious dances.

The blind and the lame, whoever they were, could not prevent David from carrying out his purpose. There is no sign of a struggle in the calm narrative of 2 Samuel. The Jebusite said, "David shall not come in hither. So [2] David took the hold of Zion: that is the city of David" (*vv.* 6, 7). Not being admitted as a guest he went in as a conqueror. His "men" knew by experience how to take possession of a hold.

The king's concern on this eventful day was not how to succeed in a military operation, but how to avoid blood-guiltiness of a most serious kind. Saul had brought guilt upon his house by slaying others of the ancient inhabitants, the Gibeonites (2 Sam. xxi. 1–6). David wished to avoid a guilt which was perhaps greater. The Jebusites, as the old-time guardians of an ancient sanctuary and oracle, were regarded as sacred persons. We may compare them with some of the guardians of the Grecian oracles. Thus, for example, "At Dodona the shrine seems to have been served by the *primitive and barbarous* tribe of the Selli (called byHomer *ἀνιπτόποδες χαμαιεῦναι*)." [3] The Jebusites may certainly be described as "primitive," and as dwelling in a "hold" they might be called "barbarous." David in ordering his men to take possession of the place forbids them to defile the Jebusite sanctuary with Jebusite blood. That the blind and the lame were to be *spared* is clearly acknowledged by at least one ancient authority, for the Peshitta (according to the

[1] The Hebrews sometimes distorted the names of foreign gods, *e.g.*, "Nego" for *Nebo* (Dan. iii. 12), and perhaps "Nisroch" for *Marduk* (2 Kings xix. 37). With פסחים "lame" *cf.* ויפסחו "and they leaped" (1 Kings xviii. 26) of the dancing of the priests of Baal.

[2] "Nevertheless" (A.V., R.V.) is simply not admissible as a translation of *waw* consecutive.

[3] E. A. Gardner, *Cambridge Companion to Greek Studies*, p. 339.

true text)[1] renders, "Whosoever shall smite a Jebusite and shall come near with shield to the blind and the lame, he hateth the soul of David."

In verse 8 the crux is of course the meaning of the *tsinnor*. "Watercourse" has been suggested, and appeal is made to Psalm xlii. 8 (7), where R.V. margin has "cataracts." More recently "tunnel" has been proposed, because there actually exists a passage cut in the rock "which ends at the top of the hill on which the original fortress of Zion must have been situated" (S. R. Driver, *Notes on Samuel*, p. 260, ed. 2). This tunnel, or some similar one not yet discovered, might well have been regarded by reason of its echoes as sacred to a god who gave oracles. The verb "touch" (LXX ἅπτέσθω) certainly suggests that some sacred object is meant. It is just possible that the reference may be to some hollow vessel (like the bronze caldrons of Dodona) which when struck emitted a sound which the priests interpreted, taking it as an utterance of the god. (A word supposed to be cognate to *tsinnor* is used in Zechariah iv. 12 (צִנְתְּרוֹת) to designate the *pipes* through which the seven-branched candlestick was fed.) David denounces the man who lays an impure hand on some object held sacred by the Jebusites.

If the original form of verse 8 was at all like that suggested above, we have an easy explanation of the confusion into which the text afterwards fell. David says that he will hate the man who kills a Jebusite, and he gives the definite order to *take alive* "the blind and the lame." How was such an attitude to be reconciled with the prescriptions of Deuteronomy, and specially with xx. 16, 17, "Thou shalt save nothing alive that breatheth; but thou shalt utterly destroy them; the Hittite, and the Amorite, the Canaanite, and

[1] So the Urmi edition of 1900 (Nestorian) and the Codex Ambrosianus (ed. Ceriani).

the Perizzite, the Hivite, and the *Jebusite*" ? A scribe who was persuaded that David attained to the Deuteronomic standard of religion would feel compelled to transfer the description "hated of David's soul" from the slayer of the Jebusite to the Jebusites themselves. In so doing he might well feel that he was emending a corrupted text. Again, when he came to the startling command, *Ye shall save the blind and the lame alive*, he might well doubt whether he had read the words aright. If in some copies, as apparently in the copy which lay before the Septuagint themselves, the words תתפשו חיים were already omitted through *homœoteleuton*, the scribe we speak of would be confirmed in his belief that they formed no part of the true text.

To conclude. It has been shown, I think, that in the book of Samuel (*a*) the evidence is *against* the view that the "hold of Zion" was a formal fortress or citadel; (*b*) there is no statement that David stormed a fortified height. It has been shown further that (*c*) the evidence as to the fate of the Jebusites is slight and uncertain, and by the adoption of a defensible emendation can be made to tell in favour of their preservation. Finally an hypothesis, suggested by the language of the passage, has been stated which accounts for the mutilation of the Hebrew text. According to this hypothesis the main interest of the passage in its original form is religious, not military or political. We see David in contact with one of the old religions of Canaan. He takes possession of its sanctuary, but spares its priests. A later age impatient of heathen worship [1] has brought obscurity into the transaction, because it could not understand such forbearance on the part of a king so faithful to the worship of JEHOVAH as David.

W. EMERY BARNES.

[1] Compare the case of 2 Sam. v. 21. The statement that David's men *carried off* the images of the Philistines becomes in 1 Chron. xiv. 12, "David commanded and they were burnt with fire."

THE APOSTOLIC DECREE AGAINST ΠΟΡΝΕΙΑ.

Professor Sanday's recent article in the Expositor for October, 1913 (viii. 34), entitled "The Text of the Apostolic Decree," is so admirable a presentation of the textual evidence for Acts xv. 29 that one cannot but feel the moment opportune for presenting some further evidence as to the historical sense and bearing of the Decrees, derived from contemporary sources hitherto unaccountably overlooked.

Professor Sanday rightly emphasises the philological argument of Preuschen based on the rare term ἀλισγήμα ("pollution") used in Acts xv. 20 as a general and comprehensive term more specifically determined in verse 29 as εἰδωλόθυτα ("meats offered to idols"). Both the employment of ἀλισγήμα, and the whole context are opposed to the idea now urged by Harnack and others that the Apostolic Decrees have an ethical aim, such as the Western text labours to attach to them. Whether we include, or do not include, τοῦ πνικτοῦ (πνικτῶν) in verses 20 and 29 ("things strangled"),[1] we cannot reasonably interpret ἀπέχεσθαι αἵματος ("abstain from blood") as anything but a food law; for apart from the absurdity of "the apostles and elders in Jerusalem" thinking it needful for them to prohibit crimes of violence among their Gentile fellow-Christians, neither would ἀπέχεσθαι ("*abstain*") be an appropriate verb for such a prohibition, nor αἷμα ("blood" in the figurative sense, i.e. murder) be an appropriate noun. In addition the context as a whole is opposed to the idea that the Council felt called upon to enact moral requirements. The aim of the Western additions is to make the Decrees of "the apostles and elders" cover the whole sphere of human conduct; whereas the discourses show that the Council itself has a much more

[1] Cf. Wellhausen, "Noten zur Apg.," in *Gött. Nachr. phil.-hist. Klasse*, 1907, 19 f.

definite and circumscribed idea of its own purpose and jurisdiction.

To avoid misunderstanding, the present writer must repeat here his frequently entered protest against a harmonistic identification of the Apostolic Council of Acts xv. with either the Conference between Paul and the "Pillars" described in Galatians ii. 1–10, or any subsequent unrecorded visit of Paul and Barnabas to Jerusalem. The story of Acts xv. is neither and both. It is an idealising historian's *combination* of two distinct occasions: (1) the Conference of Paul and Barnabas with the Pillars (Gal. ii. 1–10) issuing in a division of mission fields and the first missionary journey (Acts xiii., xiv.)[1]; (2) a Conclave at Jerusalem at which neither Paul nor Peter can have been present, and probably not Barnabas. This "Apostolic" conclave *may* be implied in the ἐλθεῖν τινας ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου of Galatians ii. 12; but it was one whose Decrees cannot have been in force when Peter "ate with the Gentiles" at Antioch. Moreover they are fundamentally at variance with Paul's solution of the problem. For not only Galatians, which Lake and Emmet suppose to have been written *before* the Conclave, explaining thus its silence as to the Decrees—not only Galatians, but even more fully and specifically first Corinthians prescribes a *modus vivendi* between the "strong" and the "weak," those who reject and those who hold to "distinctions of meats," built upon the *indifference* of the distinctions for *all* believers. The Lukan *modus vivendi*, on the contrary, proceeds upon the assumption of the *permanent validity* of the Mosaic distinctions for believers of Jewish birth.

[1] Galatians i. 21, limiting Paul's missionary activity up to the date of the Conference to "Syria and Cilicia," shows that the evangelisation of Cyprus and the trans-Taurus region, in company with Barnabas and (for Cyprus) Mark, had not yet occurred. It is in contemplation at the Conference (Gal. ii. 9; cf. Acts xii. 25).

In the present writer's view the Decrees represent the solution which became valid for " Peter and all the Jews " at Antioch, and which " swept away " " even Barnabas." They represent the solution which became authoritative for " Antioch, Syria and Cilicia," and was still authoritative there at the time of composition of Acts, whose author, according to ancient tradition,[1] strongly corroborated by the internal evidence, belonged to the Antioch church. This solution has a just claim to be called " Apostolic " ; but in only a limited sense, for it was never accepted by Paul, nor by the Pauline churches beyond the Cilician Gates. It ultimately fell of its own weight ; for it was intrinsically impracticable. The reductions of the " burden " found in Revelation ii. 24 (cf. Acts xv. 28), in the *Didaché* vi. 3, in the readings of the Western Text of Acts, and in the second century Fathers generally, illustrate the gradual predominance of another solution—the Pauline solution in a modified form, made concrete and divorced from its mystical factor.

All this forestalls the question : What was the problem which the Decrees attempt to solve ? Our answer may not be admitted by those who take a different view ; but for the sake of clearness it required to be stated before returning to common ground.

Common ground we hope to find in the statement that Paul and " Luke " [2] are at one in distinguishing two stages of the controversy with the Judaisers, although Luke, by omitting the painful scene of the conflict between Paul and Peter at Antioch, has greatly blurred the outlines. Even so, however, Acts xv. does not wholly conceal the important distinctions which are made so clear in Galatians ii., by relating in their order the *two* crises in which Paul had stood

[1] Eusebius, *H.E.* III. iv. 7.

[2] The name is used of the author of Acts without prejudice to the critica question.

fast for the liberty of Christ " that the truth of the gospel might remain " an unimpaired inheritance to the Gentiles.

The first crisis turned upon the circumcision of Titus, a feature conspicuous by its absence from the story of Acts. However the difficulties of text and interpretation be met in Galatians ii. 3–10, one thing is certain : Paul feels that he won his case against the " false brethren who came in privily to spy out our liberty which we have in Christ Jesus, that they might bring us into bondage." He insists that he won it completely and without reserve, and that he won it by the hearty, unqualified endorsement of the " Pillars." The first crisis issued in hearty agreement ; but it was explicitly an " agreement to differ." Its object was disjunctive, not conjunctive, save in " the fellowship of giving and receiving."

"They that were of repute made no supplement to my gospel, but, on the contrary, when they saw that I had been entrusted with the gospel of the uncircumcision, even as Peter with that of the circumcision, the Pillars, James and Cephas and John, gave me and Barnabas right hands of fellowship that we should go to the Gentiles, but they to the circumcision. Only they would that we should remember the poor."

We cannot too strongly emphasise the fact that this unreserved endorsement, after conflict with the legalists in the case of Titus, makes it certain that the primary question whether the yoke of the law should be imposed upon Gentile converts was settled fully, completely, and without any reserves whatever, as soon as Paul had laid the matter before the Pillars. On this point there is no difference between Paul and Luke. If anything, Luke would seem even to go beyond Paul. For in Acts xv. 10 Peter's protest against the attempt to put this " yoke upon the neck " of the Gentile converts actually characterises the law as one " which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear." If this could be taken to imply a revolt on Peter's part against the con-

tinued obligation of himself and other Jews to " circumcise their children and obey the customs," it would not only be inconsistent with Luke's standpoint elsewhere, but contradictory even of Paul. For whatever Paul's personal conviction and practice, his own account of the agreement at Jerusalem implies that the Pillars took a different stand from his for themselves and those of " the circumcision." The agreement is reciprocal. The Pillars and their agents will make no proselytes among Paul's converts, *and* Paul and Barnabas will keep within corresponding bounds. The implication is clear, and corroborates the ancient testimony of Irenæus: " The Apostles allowed the Gentiles to act freely; but they themselves continued in the ancient observances." [1] We may be sure that Luke himself means no otherwise, because his own subsequent narrative is explicit. In the later interview of Paul with " James and the elders " in Acts xxi. 24–26, where the matter is taken up again, the public participation of Paul in the temple sacrifices is said to have been undertaken expressly for the purpose of proving that there was " no truth in " the report that Paul was " teaching the Jews resident among the Gentiles to forsake Moses, telling them not to circumcise their children, neither to walk after the customs." Now Luke's *interpretation* of this act of Paul is incredible. It is irreconcilable with Paul's insistence that Peter when " among the Gentiles " at Antioch should disregard his Mosaic scruples. It is flagrantly contrary to the principle that the cross has made circumcision or uncircumcision a matter of indifference (Gal. ii. 19–21 ; iii. 13). But the *act* is not incredible. Interpreted as a demonstration of Paul's willingness to " become as under the law to them that are under the law," it supports the principle. It is a proof of Paul's loyalty to his pledge not to conduct a propaganda among " the circumcision."

[1] *Her.* III. xiv. 15.

Acts xv. 10 f. must be understood in accordance with the Lukan *interpretation* of Paulinism, not in accordance with the genuine Pauline doctrine of "justification apart from (χωρίς) law." On this basis it cannot be consistently interpreted otherwise than in the sense: *Without the supplementary* "grace of the Lord Jesus" the yoke of the law is unbearable even for Jews. This sense accords with the better interpretation of Acts xiii. 39, and of the Lukan narrative throughout. But even if the other (Pauline) sense be adopted it will only indicate that in Acts xv. 10, as in Acts xi. 3, 20 (*vera lectio*), and some other cases, Luke has been betrayed by a source more universalistic than himself into some unguarded expressions. Luke's own view is that *for Jews* "the grace of the Lord Jesus is a supplement to meet the deficiencies of that justification which is through the law." This is still perhaps the idea of "grace" cherished by "the man in the street." It has naïve illustration in the epitaph of the Englishman whose name is borne by the university whence we write:—

> "Much good he did, some ill; so hope all's even
> And that his soul, through grace, is gone to heav'n."

But it is not Paulinism.

Paul and Luke agree, then, in their account of the first crisis. On the question raised by the men who "came down from Judaea and taught the brethren, Except ye be circumcised after the custom of Moses ye cannot be saved" (Acts xv. 1), the Judaisers were immediately and completely ruled out of court. There was no difficulty, no lack of harmony, till a second stage was reached, a problem which, according to Paul, was not raised at the Jerusalem conference,[1] either because not foreseen, or because those who fore-

[1] The subsequent vacillation of Peter at Antioch proves it had not yet been settled. Had we (as some hold) in Galatians ii. 1–10 and 11–27 an inversion of the chronological order Paul would have been bound to explain to the Galatians what was done at Jerusalem about the great issue raised at Antioch.

saw it tacitly assumed each that it would be settled his way.

The new problem was the problem of "the Jews which are among the Gentiles." It was a problem which in the nature of the case could not arise until after the admission to fellowship of Gentiles unburdened by the law. It was the problem how this fellowship should be maintained where one party was under ceremonial restrictions and the other not. The "fellowship of giving and receiving," beyond which the Jerusalem Conference did not go (Gal. ii. 6–10), would promote the right spirit, but it did not grapple with the real issue. The crucial point would be "eating together."

According to Galatians the issue was not drawn till "Peter came to Antioch." Of course it could not be until some representative of the Jewish-Christian interpretation of the disjunctive agreement made between the representatives of the two "apostleships" came among the Gentiles. At first it was not even drawn "when Peter came to Antioch"; because Peter at first quite naturally followed the practice of Paul and other Christian Jews, who among Gentiles became "as without the law." But before long[1] came the delegation "from James," who put the matter in so different a light that Peter and "all the rest of the Jews" drew back, and refused any longer to eat with the Gentiles, until "even Barnabas was carried away with their hypocrisy."

The point at issue in this story of the disagreement at Antioch cannot really be a matter of doubt. The absolute freedom of the Gentile had been conceded in the agreement at Jerusalem, and could not be taken back. What had *not* been conceded at Jerusalem was the freedom of the *Jew*. Must then "the Jews which are among the Gentiles" relinquish their ceremonial purity by eating with their Gentile

[1] Apparently during the absence of Paul and Barnabas on the first Missionary Journey. Mark's return to Antioch (and Jerusalem) (Acts xv. 38) may have given occasion to it.

brethren, ignoring the "distinctions of meats" and the "pollutions of idols"? Paul holds that if occasion really requires they must. They have no right "to *compel* the Gentiles to Judaise" (*τί ἀναγκάζεις τὰ ἔθνη Ἰουδαΐζειν;*). His ground is the doctrine of the cross as abolishing the legal relation. Every Christian, Jew or Gentile, "died to the law" when he "put his faith in Christ Jesus to be justified by faith in Christ and not by works of law." Therefore, because distinction of meats is not a matter of necessity (*ἀνάγκη*), but a concession to their "weakness" of faith, Jewish Christians must rely on such generous consideration for their scruples as their Gentile brethren ought for Christ's sake to show. In point of fact a very large element in Paul's letters consists of entreaties to these "strong" adherents of his own to show this forbearance, and not "for meat's sake" to put stumblingblocks in the path of the "weak."[1]

The delegation "from James" held differently. They laid the Gentiles under "compulsion" in the matter of "distinctions of meats," and seem to have carried with them permanently both Peter, and "all the rest of the Jews," including Barnabas. Even the great Syrian church with its dependencies, which looked up to Barnabas as its leader, sided against Paul. What was the "compulsion" (*ἀναγκάζεις*) instigated by the delegates "from James"?

It is inconceivable that men of this stamp and standing should have dreamed of rescinding at Antioch the action so solemnly taken at Jerusalem, where the "Pillars" had recognised the absolute freedom of the Gentiles. Peter and the Jews at Antioch were not *consciously* "compelling the

[1] So Romans xiii. 8–xv. 13. Purity in xiii. 11–14, consideration for the "weak" in the matter of "meats" and holy days in c. xiv. So 1 Thessalonians iv. 2–12. The greater part of first Corinthians (1 Cor. v.–xi. 1) is taken up with directions about sexual purity and "meats offered to idols." Both—fornication and partaking in heathen banquets—are generalised as "idolatry" in 1 Corinthians x. 14.

Gentiles to Judaise." They were simply interpreting the agreement made at Jerusalem as every man would naturally interpret it who did not appreciate Paul's doctrine of the cross as *abolishing the legal relation*. If Jewish believers are still under divine *obligation* to hold to the law, then they have a right to lay down certain requirements as "necessary" (ἐπαναγκές) conditions of such acts of fellowship as eating together, though only such as are for the protection of their own ritual purity. They may stipulate before consenting to sit at a Gentile's table that nothing at it shall bring involuntary defilement upon them. If the stipulation go beyond what is necessary for the Jews' protection, it will justly be resented. If it be confined to this, it may be regarded as reasonable and fair, not because it is "necessary" to the Gentile's salvation, but "necessary" to the Jew's ceremonial purity. Paul does not mention a single Christian of Jewish descent at Antioch who stood out with himself against the reasoning that held it right to "compel the Gentiles to Judaise" to this extent. The most probable explanation of this remarkable silence is that Paul's paradoxical reasoning (Gal. ii. 18–21) that the Law, valid and obligatory (for Jews) up to the date of Calvary, had ceased from the moment of the crucifixion to have binding force, was not accepted by any influential element in the Syrian church; as indeed it remained unintelligible to the fathers of the second century.

Thus far we have sought merely to make clear the situation implied in Galatians ii. 11–21. It is more difficult, because of the omission by Luke of the intervening step of Peter's coming to Antioch and his vacillating conduct there, to find in Acts xv. the same clear distinction of the first from the second stage in the conflict. Luke represents the whole controversy as settled by "the apostles and elders in Jerusalem" at one sitting; so that all Pauline disagreement is

obliterated, just as in Acts no trace is left of the long and bitter subsequent conflict between Paul and the Judaisers, save the representation in Acts xxi. 21–26, already referred to, that Paul repudiated as a slander the statement that he did not himself set the example to "the Jews *among the Gentiles*" of "walking orderly, keeping the law." Nevertheless there remains enough even in Acts xv. to show that here too the Decrees are enacted in the interest of Jewish-Christian ritual purity. They are not proposed as a minimum of Mosaism imposed upon Gentile believers as a condition of their admission; still less as a new Ten Commandments formulated for babes in the faith. They are proposed as "necessary" for the protection of those who thus far have relied on Mosaic distinctions of meats against the involuntary defilement they will be liable to incur as a consequence of the new conditions. In short, the agreement with the Pillars had been primarily disjunctive, the proposal of James is intended to be conjunctive.

This deeper confirmation of Galatians ii. by Acts xv. appears in three ways. It appears (1) in the separation of the proposal of Peter from that of James, making in reality two stages of the discussion, though brought within the limits of a single Council. (2) It appears (obscurely) in the motive supplied by James in verse 21 for his proposal. It appears (3) in the intrinsic character of the Decrees enacted. To make this clear we must devote some attention to each of these points of evidence, laying principal stress, however, upon the third.

(1) The proposal of James to enjoin upon Gentile converts "to abstain from the pollutions of idols" is represented by Luke as separate from, and supplementary to, the proposal of Peter. It is not offered, however, in opposition to any part of it, as though James felt it to be too sweeping in its recognition of Gentile independence. On the contrary, it

is prefaced by an unreserved acceptance of Gentile Christianity as a long predetermined work of God. God, as foretold in prophecy, has " visited the Gentiles to take out of them a people for His name." They are, then, an independent people of God, upon whom His earlier people cannot presume to impose a yoke.

The critical word here is the word ἐπαναγκές, " necessary." Why, and on whose account, are these four kinds of abstinence proposed as " necessary," even for Gentiles ? Why does recognition of a second " people of the Lord " free from the law require a supplement ?

The only answer in Acts to this question is the difficult utterance of James in xv. 21, which we are about to discuss. It is important, however, to observe meantime that the fact that Luke also regards the Decrees as a corollary to the proposal of Peter, and not in conflict with it, confirms the distinction of Paul's narrative between the unqualified acknowledgement of Gentile equality, independence, and freedom from the law obtained by him at the Agreement in Jerusalem, and the attempt to regulate relations between the two independent peoples which provoked the Disagreement at Antioch.

(2) The motive placed by Luke (Acts xv. 21) in the mouth of James to justify his proposal is confessedly obscure.[1] The only fact apparent upon the surface is that the proposed enactments have something to do with " the Jews which are among the Gentiles " and their proselytes. For brevity's sake we may attempt to bring out by paraphrase what appears to be the logical relation of the discourse of James to the context.

" Brethren, you are about to recognise Gentile believers

[1] For a detailed exegetical study of the passage of much value, see *Journal of Bibl. Lit.*, xv. (1896), pp. 75, 81, art. " Acts xv. 21," by J. H Ropes.

as a second 'people of God'; and this action is necessary and right, for God has both foretold the conversion of the Gentiles in the prophets, and also set the seal of His approval on this present work. He has put His Name upon these converts by pouring gifts of the Spirit upon them, though baptized in uncircumcision. We and they have received the same Spirit of Adoption. But much depends on how our recognition and acknowledgment is made. The Christian propaganda is not first in the field. A mission to the Gentiles already exists co-extensive with the civilised world. For generations this propaganda has been in progress in every city where a Jewish synagogue exists, and there can be no concealing the difference between it and that of Barnabas and Saul; because every Sabbath in the synagogue the Mosaic law is read, which provides for the separateness of God's people from all pollution of the world. The question turns upon the attitude of the new propaganda to the old. If we stop with the simple recognition of a 'people of God' without the law, we break down the wall of separation which excludes the pollution of the idolatrous world from the household of God. Having free access to the Court of the Gentiles it will be impossible to exclude it from the Court of Israel. Since, then, we acknowledge the necessity for such as already believe under the forms taught by the synagogue, of protecting our purity by the distinctions of Moses, some corresponding law of 'purity' is a necessity for all Christians. Let it be so framed that 'pollutions' (*ἀλισγήματα*) from the idol world cannot penetrate from them to us. It is a duty to ourselves, as a people separate from the world, and to the life of God in us, to guard the wall of separation."

Our paraphrase is expanded because the obscurity of the original seems to be chiefly due to condensation. But however concise, Luke makes apparent (*a*) that the proposal

of James is made in the expectation of perpetuating the distinction of a Christianised people of the Lord (Jews and proselytes) among the Gentiles who shall continue the observance of the law from a Gentile-Christian people who will be free from it. (*b*) It is also apparent that the object of the proposed enactments is that the relations of these two peoples of the Lord shall be cordial, without degenerating into obliteration of the distinctions which separate both from the world of the "idols" around—distinctions which, as we shall see, have a quasi-sacramental character, so that he who violates them as it were pollutes by alien contact the indwelling life of God. The key-words of the verse are *κηρύσσοντας Μωσῆν*, and *ἀναγινωσκόμενος*. They justify our interpretation of the proposal as having mainly in view the two objects just defined. In what sharp contrast they stand to the ideals of Paul will be apparent from a glance at Galatians ii. 15–21; iii. 16, 26–28; Eph. ii. 13–22, and similar passages.

(3) The ultimate decision regarding Luke's solution of the problem of Jew and Gentile in the Church must rest with the intrinsic character of the Decrees themselves. That they constitute no fiction of the author of Acts but have as their basis some authentic document is apparent from the superscription of the "letter." The enactments are addressed to "the Gentile brethren in Antioch, Syria and Cilicia," indicating that the trans-Taurus mission field has not yet come into view. This represents the source. *Luke* gives them universal application and even makes Paul and Silas distribute them in the cities of *Galatia* (Acts xvi. 4). As emanating from James and "the Apostles," as accepted by Antioch, including "Peter and all the rest of the Jews," not "even Barnabas" excepted, they have a right to be called the "Apostolic" Decrees; but unless their intrinsic sense is quite different from that which a truly historical exegesis

seems to us to impose, they could never have had the assent of Paul nor of the Pauline churches.

As regards questions of text the discussions of Preuschen, Wellhausen, Lake, Sanday, and others may be deemed to have established the reading of our ordinary text with a bare possibility that the references to "things strangled" should be omitted. With regard to interpretation, especially in the light of early Jewish-Christian literature, the case is different. Here we know of no study more thorough than that of K. Six, S.J., entitled *Das Apostoldekret* (Act. 15, 28. 29). *Seine Entstehung und Geltung in den ersten vier Jahrhunderten* (Innsbruck, 1912). Six has brought together a host of patristic citations showing the bearing of the Decrees as food-laws, and in particular has shown from the *Clementina* that the connective idea which unifies the group is the danger of "communion with demons" (cf. 1 Cor. x. 20) They are not moral. They are not a portion of Mosaism retained at the sacrifice of the rest. They are a purity law intended to meet the same object of protection against the *ἀλισγήματα τῶν εἰδώλων* which the Mosaic is understood to aim at; but from the standpoint of men under a new dispensation. If Preuschen, Sanday, Lake, and others have vindicated (as the present writer holds) the priority of the received text over the Western form, Six has done equal service in establishing this "connective idea." Ancient testimony, Jewish, Christian and heathen, proves that the Decrees, in sharp distinction from Paul, rest upon a sacramentarian, or quasi-magical, conception of the value of "distinctions of meats." Paul holds that "there is nothing unclean of itself." Pollution can only be moral and voluntary. "To him that esteemeth anything to be unclean" or that "eateth with offence," to him it is polluting, because his own will is involved. Not so with the Jewish-Christian view, and the common post-Pauline idea. It interprets food-laws in

general as protecting the life of God resident in the member of His household from contamination by intermixture with demonic life. The sexual act transmits life, assimilation of food sustains it. Both acts are sacramental in the heathen religions, uniting the life of the participant with the life of a *daimon*. Therefore in Jewish and early Christian belief they are capable of a kind of ἀλισγῆμα which is more than moral, and borders on the magical. Jewish belief of the type represented in the *Clementina* and the Decrees places the eating of εἰδωλόθυτα and fornication on the same footing, because he who surrenders the protection of the food-laws exposes himself to the same danger of "alienation from the life of God" (to use a Pauline phrase) as he who "makes his members the members of a harlot." With Paul only the voluntary participation in an idol feast can be grouped with fornication, because there can be no involuntary union with the life of a demon. The Decrees add a prohibition of "blood" and (probably) "things strangled" to εἰδωλόθυτα and fornication, not because some Old Testament "distinctions of meats" are regarded as more important than others, but because the current understanding of "distinctions of meats" is that they protect the indwelling divine life from union with demonic. The Old Testament itself reflects the ancient belief that "the blood is the life." According to current ideas [1] "demons feed on things strangled," as well as "on blood"—doubtless because the breath (πνεῦμα) not being permitted to escape to its own source (Eccles. iii. 21), as the blood according to Leviticus xvii. 10–14; Deuteronomy xii. 23 f., must be, furnishes sustenance to the demon; for the demon, of course, is nourished by the invisible, not

[1] Origen (*Contr. Celsus*, VIII. 24 ff.) explains the exception of εἰδωλόθυτα, things strangled and blood, from the freedom of Christians from food-laws on the ground that eating of εἰδωλόθυτα gives communion with demons, things strangled are, "as they say," the food of false gods, and the same is true of blood.

the visible part. Thus the unifying view-point of the Decrees is not to be found in the Old Testament, but in a sacramentarian conception of *life* as uniting men either to God or demonic powers.

Those who have been baptized into the Name become thereby sharers in a mystical divine life. In the language of Paul, their life is "hid with Christ in God." This life is sustained by the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ. But sacramental mysticism is not merely Pauline. It is as old as the sacraments themselves. The influence of Paul was exerted to raise pre-existing conceptions of a more magical character to a purely moral level. It was so in regard to the spiritual gifts. It is so in the case of the Decrees. They represent the attitude of the "weak," afraid to rest on purely moral union with the life of God, afraid of *involuntary* contamination.[1]

The parallels adduced by Six go far to show why "fornication" is grouped with the three other food abstinences in the Decrees. The four represent the mystical or sacramentarian doctrine of the new religion on its negative side. The two prohibitions which are later dropped (Rev. ii. 14, 20, 24; cf. *Did.* vi. 3) are the two in which no moral factor appears. Paul's "moral view" had some ultimate effect. But the distinction so clearly made by Paul is not here drawn. The authors of the Decrees think them "necessary" (ἐπαναγκές), because they are afraid (as even second and third century Christians remain afraid) that the life of God in which they have become sharers may suffer contamination with, *and also without*, their consent.

There remains, however, one point on which Six has failed

[1] According to *Clem. Recogn.* IV. 36, mortal sins pollute the garment of baptism (indumentum baptismi), "but the things which pollute soul *and body together* are these: partaking of the table of demons, that is, eating things offered to idols, or blood, or things torn of beasts, *or strangled*, or whatever else is offered to the demons." Cf. 1 Corinthians vi. 18.

to throw adequate light. Indeed he strongly opposes the idea that the Decrees represent legislation enacted for the purpose of furnishing a *modus vivendi* between the two "peoples of the Lord" recognised in the discourse of their propounder. And yet considerations (1) and (2) have surely given some ground for holding that the propounder recognises the independence of the new people without the law from the old, and the restriction of the "burden" to what is "necessary" suggests that he recognises limitations of jurisdiction. We cannot but feel that a few further passages from that Ebionite literature which Six has examined to such advantage would have made it clearer why the older people of the Lord feel justified in making certain stipulations as "necessary" to mutual intercourse, and why the four stipulations include one which, as apparently purely moral, should seemingly be left to the conscience of their Gentile brethren.

As regards the horror felt by the "weak" against involuntary "pollution" from foods, Six gives a long series of parallels which throw light upon the Pauline distinction between eating meats over which the thanksgiving (εὐχαριστία) to God has been pronounced, which may be done with impunity (Rom. xiv. 3, 6); and partaking of εἰδωλόθυτα at a heathen feast, which is a "communion with demons," estranging from Christ and subjecting to the demons (1 Cor. x. 7 f., 14–22). But we may properly add one from the heathen philosopher Porphyry, who, according to Eusebius (*Prep. Ev.*, iv. 23) held the common view that

"bodies are full of evil spirits; for they particularly delight in foods of various kinds. So, when we eat they approach and seize upon the body. Hence the dedications (libations, thanksgivings, etc.). . . . They particularly delight in blood and impure foods, and take advantage of them to slip into those who use them." [1]

[1] Quoted by Heitmüller, *Relig. in Gesch. u. Geg.*, s.v. "Abendmahl." The "strong" Christian naturally holds that the εὐχαριστία to God ut-

But we are principally concerned with the distinctively Jewish-Christian view. Thus in *Clem. Hom.*, ix. 9 Peter warns his hearers against the orgies of idol-worship, explaining that

"the demons, having power through the food given to them, are admitted to your bodies by your own hands; and lying hid there for a long time they become *blended with your souls*."

We are here on a low plane of superstition as compared with the lofty rebukes of Paul. But there is a point of resemblance in the fundamental idea. Paul himself does not rebuke fornication as a sin against the family. He puts his prohibition, like that of the εἰδωλόθυτα at the heathen banquets, on mystical and religious grounds. "Every (other) sin that a man doeth is without the body; but he that committeth fornication sinneth against his own body." The act of union with a harlot (usually a temple harlot acting in the service of Aphrodite) in one body, is the opposite of union to the Lord in one spirit (1 Cor. vi. 13–20). Thus the parallel between "meats" and "fornication" rests ultimately even in Paul upon a heathen mysticism which regards the two functions of nutrition and reproduction as special means of union with divine life, and consequently gave both a place in its ritual. Neither the Decrees nor the Pauline rebuke of fornication can be understood by mere recourse to the Old Testament. Both require such insight into the general background of ancient belief as the *Clementina* afford when compared with contemporary heathen belief and practice. Paul and the Jewish-Christian writer both acquiesce in the current mystical conception of the phenomena of nutrition and reproduction. But there is a vital difference. Paul, as we have seen, denies the possibility of con-

tered over the food which sustains his life dispels all possibility of its becoming to him a "communion with demons," just as he holds that in the transmission of life the "holy" predominates over the "unclean" (1 Cor. vii. 14).

tamination of the life which by divine grace dwells in the Christian without his conscious act. The union cannot occur without consent. The Clementine writer, adopting the same equivalence, heathen god=demon, holds that a Christian may come into union of life with a demon if he neglect divinely ordained distinctions of meats, more particularly if he eats those which demons are supposed to subsist upon. In like manner for Paul true marriage is a "great mystery" (Eph. v. 25–32), partaking of the nature of the union of "Christ and the Church." It is well on the way toward becoming a Christian sacrament. Conversely fornication "makes the members of Christ members of a harlot." In this, and the wilful participation in an idol feast, one may celebrate a Satanic sacrament. But with Paul ceremonial protection is not "necessary," because there is no union without moral consent. Just as food dedicated to God cannot harm the Christian (Rom. xiv. 6), so there is no demonic power which can separate from the love of God in Christ (Rom. viii. 38 f.). Union of life whether with God or demon must be *moral.*

But we have more to learn from the *Clementina.* In particular Peter's instructions to the mother of his convert in *Hom.* xiii. 4 throw light upon the word ἐπαναγκές in the Decrees, about which doubt was raised. Here too withdrawal from table fellowship is excused on the ground of religious "necessity":—

"I wish you to know, O woman, the course of life involved in our religion. We worship one God, Who made the world which you see; and we keep His law, which has for its chief injunctions to worship Him alone, to honour our parents, to be chaste, and to live piously. *In addition to this,* we do not live with all indiscriminately; nor do we take our food from the same table as Gentiles, inasmuch as we *cannot* eat along with them, because they live impurely (i.e. in religious relation to hostile powers). . . . For not even if it were our father, or mother, or wife, or child, or any other person having a claim by nature on our affection, can we venture to take

our meals with him ; for *our religion compels us* to make a distinction. *Do not then take it as an insult* that your son does not eat with you until you adopt his belief and practice."

Here is found still in full force, at least to the close of the second century, the stipulation exacted by " Peter and all the Jews " at Antioch after the coming of the delegation " from James." But the utmost is done to avoid wounding the feelings of the mother. Religious necessity " compels " the separation. It is unavoidable under pain of their souls' salvation. This is the counterpart of the situation in Acts xv. 28. The older people of the Lord have recognised the full and equal rights of the younger. They do not presume to impose any moral yoke upon them. It is what they themselves are obliged to observe " in addition " which prompts the " further burden." In *self-protection* they will be obliged to withhold fellowship until the four rules are observed. They are " necessary " to protect the purity of the Jew.

Why, then, is " fornication " included ? A final extract from *Clem. Hom.*, iii. 68, will dispel this last remaining perplexity. This too is " necessary " for the protection of the purity of the *Jew*. After commending marriage as a protection against burning lust (cf.1 Cor. vii. 9), which might otherwise " bring a plague upon the Church by reason of fornication or adultery " (cf. 1 Cor. x. 8), the Ebionite writer continues :—

" For above every other sin the wickedness of adultery is hated by God, *because it not only destroys the person himself who sins, but those also who eat and associate with him.* For it is like the madness of a dog, because it has the nature of communicating its own madness. . . . For the sin of him who commits adultery necessarily comes upon all."

Compare with this mystical treatment of sexual immorality the declaration of Paul (1 Cor. vi. 15–20) that every other sin but this is " without the body " ; whereas " he that

committeth fornication sinneth against his own body," because his members are perverted from being a " sanctuary of the Holy Ghost " and " members of Christ " and made " the members of a harlot." Compare his command to " have no company with such an one (the fornicator), no, not to eat," (1 Cor. v. 9–11). Compare, from a date midway between Paul and the *Clementina*, a passage illustrative of the same sense as in the *Clementina* (but *not* in Paul) of the necessity of guarding against it even in others lest one be oneself contaminated by the " pollutions of idols." It appears in the direction in Mandate IV. 1 of *The Shepherd* of Hermas :—

" If, therefore in such deeds as these (adultery and fornication) a man continue, and repent not, keep away from him and do not live with him. *Otherwise thou also art a partaker of his sin.*"

We need not add further references. Sexual immorality is classed with the " pollutions of idols " because, like the use of sacrificial food, it unites to alien life, especially of the demons. It may properly be included among self-protective stipulations made in the interest of those for whom God has appointed a wall of separation to keep them unspotted from an impure world, because unlike all other sins it involves not only the guilty man, but " those who eat or associate with him."

Thus understood the Apostolic Decrees form a consistent group. They are the self-protective regulations " necessary " to the preservation of the " purity " of the people of the Lord that are under the law, in their intercourse with the new people of the Lord without the law. They cannot have been in force " when Peter came to Antioch." But the limitation of their address to Antioch and its παροικία suggests that the time of their enactment was *before* the results of the first Missionary Journey were known in Jerusalem, perhaps the time when the delegates came " from James,"

and brought Peter, Barnabas, and the Antioch church over to the "Apostolic" way of thinking.

B. W. Bacon.

THE TRANSMISSION OF THE GOSPEL.

A German philologist once, when summarizing scientific method, posed the principle that one good argument is better than any number of bad arguments. By a good argument he probably meant one which could not be rejected without violation of something like natural law. For the study of the transmission of the Gospel such an argument has been provided by the late Professor Nestle in an observation dealing with Matthew xii. 19, where Isaiah xlii. 2 is thus quoted: "He shall not strive nor cry," *οὐκ ἐρίσει οὐδὲ κραυγάσει*. The Hebrew text offers, "He shall not cry nor lift up [his voice]"; [1] the LXX, "He shall not cry nor raise [the pitch of his voice]"; [2] whence comes the word "strive" in the Greek text of Matthew? It comes, as Nestle observed, from the *Peshiṭta of the Old Testament*, quoted in the Lewisian Syriac: which indeed means, "He shall not cry nor shout"; [3] but the Syriac *n'rīb* would be rendered by any one who was more familiar with Hebrew than Syriac by "he shall strive," because *rīb* is a common Hebrew word for "strive," whereas the Syriac word is not quite common. Nestle's observation gives us a simple and convincing explanation of the source of the word *strive* in the Greek text of Matthew, and it is an observation of the utmost importance. For the Peshiṭta Old Testament is elsewhere employed in the Lewisian text of Matthew, where quotations from the Old Testament are introduced, and it is only from this Syriac text that one

[1] לא יצעק ולא ישא
[2] *οὐ κεκράξεται οὐδὲ ἀνήσει.*
[3] לא נקעא ולא נריב.

could find its way into the Greek Gospel. Hence we draw the inference that the Greek copy of the first Gospel is fundamentally a translation of the Syriac Gospel preserved, though it may be in a revised shape, in the Lewisian text.

If the Syriac Gospel had been translated or composed for Jewish readers, we should have expected the quotations from the Old Testament to be made in the original language, as Jewish writers of Arabic habitually cite them. It is clear that in many cases where the Syriac and Greek texts quote the Peshitta and the LXX the argument requires the Hebrew text; thus in Matthew xiii. 15 the Hebrew text of Isaiah vi. 10, according to which the Prophet is commanded to make the heart of his people fat, i.e. to mystify them, is alone appropriate to the context, though the Syriac and the Greek Gospels follow their respective versions of the Old Testament. In some cases, however, the Hebrew text was too obviously required to permit of this process. Thus in Matthew xxvii. 9 the reference to the Potter rendered the Greek and Syriac versions of Zechariah xi. 13 useless; since for "potter" the first has "furnace," the second "treasury." There are, however, places where the argument seems to require one or other of these ancient versions; so in Matthew iv. 6, where the Saviour is advised to fling Himself from a pinnacle of the Temple because in Psalm xci. 11 there is a promise that the angels "will guard thee in all thy ways and lift thee upon hands lest thou strike thy foot against a stone," the Peshitta rendering of this passage, quoted in the Lewisian Syriac, seems to suit the argument best: "and on their *arms* shall they carry thee, lest thou stumble with thy foot." For whereas the promise in the Hebrew seems to refer to helping over obstacles this clearly refers to carrying in the arms.

The quotations, then, suggest that in the Greek Gospel there are three layers—a Hebrew layer, a Syriac layer and a

Greek layer; and it is the presence of the intermediate layer which follows with certainty from Nestle's observation. Now the tradition is that Matthew wrote in *Hebrew*, and it seems doubtful whether the Hebrew language has ever been confused with the Syriac except by people who knew neither. Where the phrase "in the Hebrew tongue" occurs in the New Testament it means actually in Hebrew; the words thus cited in the Apocalypse, *Abaddon* (ix. 11) and *Har-Mageddon* (xvi. 16) are distinctly Hebrew. The same is true of those cited in the Fourth Gospel, *Golgotha* (xix. 13), *Gabbatha* (xix. 17), and *Beth-Ḥesda* (v. 2). They have indeed Syriac terminations; but the names are themselves Hebrew, though *Gabbatha* is mistranslated. Similarly we should be justified in saying "Harmony is a Greek word," "Homer was called by the Greeks the Poet," though the terminations of the Greek forms have been omitted. The supposition that the Hebrew names have come into the Greek text through a Syriac intermediary sufficiently accounts for the facts.

For the language of Jerusalem in the time of Christ the only evidence which we can safely use is that of Josephus; because we possess his works in their original dialect, and are not confronted with difficult questions of authorship and transmission before we can use them. According to him the Hebrew language has a similar alphabet and similar sound to those of Syriac, but is a different idiom.[1] He does not, however, distinguish his native language from that of the Old Testament. *Chittim* is a form in use "among us."[2] Since, then, his language was identical with that of the Old Testament and only akin to Syriac, we must infer from this statement that according to him the language of Jerusalem was not Syriac, but Hebrew.

[1] *Antiquities*, XII. ii. § 1.
[2] *Antiquities*, I. vi. § 1.

Where we look for specimens of the actual language in use in his time his evidence is apt to be elusive; thus he professes to give the "native Jewish appellation" of a place, and then gives Greek words, *Ἀκανθῶν αὐλών*.[1] The explanation of this appears to be the following. Words in a foreign language convey no meaning to those who are ignorant of it, and are even apt to give offence. Either, then, Josephus himself changed his mind and decided to give a Greek translation instead of the original appellation, or some copyist substituted the Greek rendering. In one case, however, we appear to see behind the veil, and, as often happens, a mistranslation helps us where a correct translation would be useless. This is in the *Jewish War*, V. vi. § 4, where watchers call out, when a machine is about to discharge a projectile, in the native language, "The Son is coming."[2] Many centuries ago the true explanation of this was given; the words in the "native language" were בראה אבן, wrongly translated as בא הבן, but meaning "a stone is coming." Now all the words here employed, those for "son," "stone," and "is coming," are Hebrew, not Syriac. Whence it follows that Hebrew was the language used by the besieged Jews.

When, therefore, the tradition makes Matthew compile the first Gospel in Hebrew, this statement is *prima facie* plausible; but what underlies the Greek Matthew is not a Hebrew text, but a Syriac text, largely preserved, as we have seen, in the Lewisian text. Of this series the clearest case is to be found in the words spoken on the cross, quoted from Psalm xxii. 1. The Lewisian text of Matthew xxvii. 46 quotes them as they are found in the Peshiṭta of the Old Testament (except that the Hebrew form for "my God" is retained); with no sug-

[1] *Jewish War*, V. ii. § 1.
[2] *ὁ υἱὸς ἔρχεται.*

gestion that the actual words used by the Saviour are being recorded. In Mark xv. 34 it quotes them precisely as they are found in the Peshiṭta of the Old Testament. The Greek MSS. take over this quotation (with slight alteration) from the Lewisian Syriac, supposing it to be the original, though the famous MS. D restores the Hebrew. Now the Lewisian text of Matthew preserves the first word of the Hebrew (*ēli*, Syriac *elāhy* or *elōhy*) because it is necessary for the narrative; the Hebrew form might be confused with the vocative of *Elias*, whereas this could scarcely occur with the Syriac form. That the words were actually cited in the Hebrew original (if the narrative be veracious) cannot be plausibly questioned; here, then, we have a clear case in which the Greek text is based on the Syriac.

But we learn from this example that the supposed quotations in the Greek Gospels of the actual words of the Saviour are only quotations of the Syriac translation of an original Hebrew. That such an error could be committed is not surprising to one who has made any study of translations. The Arabic translations of Aristotle which are made from Syriac treat the Syriac as the original language; and many of us must have heard sermons wherein the English of the Authorized Version was treated as the original. Why the Greek Gospels should in certain cases produce the Syriac words is not clear; but the same question might be asked of Carlyle's *Sartor Resartus*, which professes to translate whole paragraphs of German, but only here and there reproduces a German word.

Of the original Hebrew Gospel there is perhaps only one fragment in existence—the text "take no thought for the morrow" (Matt. vi. 34) preserved in the Jewish Oral tradition owing to confusion of the Author with Jesus Ben-Sira. Elsewhere we have at best the Lewisian Syriac, which appears to have undergone some revision from the Greek

translation—the theory that the Greeks were infallible having left its traces here also. Now translations are rarely equivalent to their originals, partly because translators have not the responsibility of authors, partly because no two languages are coincident; to be intelligible we must paraphrase, and are apt to paraphrase inaccurately. Take the Lewisian text of Matthew vi. 19 (Burkitt's translation), "Lay not up for yourselves treasure *in* the earth"; every one understands that precept, because it is natural to bury treasure; the earth was the natural place to deposit money until our banking system was devised; and even now stores of coin are apt to be underground. But the Greek translation has "lay not up for yourselves treasures *upon* the earth," and why? Because of what follows: "where moth and eating doth corrupt": for though men bury coin, they do not *bury* fine apparel, which only is attacked by the moth. For this clause the Lewisian text offers: "where the *sāsā* falleth and corrupteth." This is unconvincing, if *sāsā* be rendered "moth," because the depredations of the moth are not to be feared for what is buried in the earth; the danger to which reference must have been made is that to which Ben-Sira alludes when he advises men to spend their money on friends and not let it *rust* beneath the stone. But the Lewisian text clearly does not refer to the "moth," but to "rot," which is another meaning of the word *sāsā* (rendered "moth"); [1] therefore the Lewisian text "where rot falleth thereon and destroyeth" is correct. The "rot" which the speaker had in view was that which is occasioned by damp. The Hebrew word actually employed is used of brass in the Jewish Oral tradition.[2]

The coins thought of in the text were clearly copper, of which stores buried in antiquity occasionally are dis-

[1] Thesaurus Syriacus from Proverbs xiv. 30.
[2] Niddah 36b.

covered even in these days. "Copper" is used for money in Mark xii. 41.

The method of the Greek translator is here revealed, and it by no means inspires confidence; though intelligence must not be denied it. Another example may be found in Matthew xxiv. 40 (Burkitt's translation of the Lewisian Syriac), "Then two men will be in the hill, one will be taken and one left." What is meant by being "in the hill"? The Greek translator rightly is dissatisfied with this; he therefore gives the Syriac (בטורא) its Palestinian sense of "in the field." Yet what is wanted is rather a natural pair, or at any rate a case in which the two persons are together. Luke (xvii. 35) substitutes "on one bed," and puts the scene at night. He seems to have given this Syriac *toro* the sense of the Latin word. But the Syriac expression seems to mean "there shall be two on a par" or "in identical circumstances"; the definition of *ṭaur* given in the Arabic dictionaries illustrates the sense exactly: "a *ṭaur* is a thing that is commensurate, or equal in length and breadth or correspondent to a thing."[1] The Syriac usage is very similar.[2] What follows, then, "two women shall be grinding at a mill" is merely an illustration of the general principle which this verse expresses.

This example is particularly instructive, because we find that it is only in the Syriac of Matthew that the primary translation from the Hebrew is preserved; the Syriac in the case of Luke follows the Greek and indeed a "contaminated" text. A translation of the Gospel should therefore, in the case of Matthew, be made directly from the Syriac, in the other cases from the Greek.

There is no tradition that any of the Gospels was originally in Hebrew or Syriac except Matthew's, whence the Lewisian

[1] Lane.

[2] See Thesaurus Syriacus, col. 1450.

text in the case of these others is of small importance comparatively; but even the Greek text of these Gospels, where it coincides with that of Matthew, exhibits depravation. Happily we can demonstrate this by an example as cogent as that with which this article started.

In Matthew xviii. 6 (Greek) we read: "Whoso shall cause one of these little ones to stumble it is profitable for him that an *asinine mill* (μύλος ὀνικός) should be hanged about his neck and that he should be sunk in the depth of the sea." What is an *asinine mill*? Liddell and Scott hold that it means *an upper millstone*; because the "ass" in Greek meant this. Others interpret from the Latin *mola asinaria*, "a mill turned by an ass," i.e. a mill too large for a man to work. The Syriac here has "a mill of an ass"; what this means in Syriac is perhaps uncertain; but the Hebrew which it translates is found in the Jewish Oral Tradition, and we know that "the ass of a mill" means the *stand* of a mill, i.e. the wooden erection whereon the mill is mounted. This last phrase is found in the Mishnic Tractate *Zābim*, where the context leaves no doubt. The Arabs similarly use the expression *ass* where we use *horse*; when the historian Tabari went to Egypt, his friends told him he would require for his room *two asses*; he was puzzled until they explained that they meant clothes-horses.[1]

In the Tosefta (a parallel code to the Mishnah)[2] there is a rule that a hand-mill should be no nearer to a neighbour's wall than three spans from the lower stone and four from the upper, whereas an *ass-mill* should be no nearer than three spans from the *strobilos* or four from the *keleth*. The comment in the Gemara is as follows: "The reason for the former rule (the case of the hand-mill) is lest the knocking should injure the wall. But in the case of the ass-mill

[1] Yākūt, *Life of Tabari* (about 900 A.D.).
[2] Baba Bathra at the commencement.

where does the knocking come in ? What is feared in this case is the noise." The difference between the two is not, then, in the nature of the labour employed, but in the structure of the mill ; in the former case a stone is moved over the surface of another stone ; in the latter case the stone revolves on a pivot, maintaining its place. Hence the commentary called *Tosafoth* rightly urges that the ass-mill means a mill mounted on a wooden structure. And indeed if a real ass were employed, the distance of four spans would be wholly inadequate.

Hence in Matthew we get the correct series ; an original in Hebrew, having in that language a technical meaning ; a literal translation into Syriac ; and a translation of the Syriac into Greek by some one who missed the exact sense. Mark (Greek) substitutes for " asinine mill " the far easier " millstone " (ix. 42) ; but surely no one could maintain that this was the original phrase.

Of the Greek used in the second Gospel it may be said that it is on a far lower level than that of the others. Such gross errors as ὁδὸν ποιεῖν for ποιεῖσθαι, ἀφιέναι σπέρμα for καταλείπειν are not easily paralleled. From the preservation of some Syriac words in this Gospel, where the Greek text of Matthew has not got them, we should gather that its author had access to the Syriac translation of the earliest Gospel ; this appears perhaps most clearly in vii. 11 (Greek), " but ye say : If a man say to his father or mother ' Korban,' i.e. gift, whatsoever thou shalt benefit from me " ; where the Greek text of Matthew (according to the best authorities) omits the Hebrew word, and therefore the Greek text of Mark cannot have it from the Greek text of Matthew. Otherwise, however, it is in Matthew that the genuine form of this passage appears.

Korban was a form of vow ; Josephus states that the laws of the Tyrians forbade foreign oaths, among others

that which is called Korban ; [1] and for this he cites the authority of Theophrastus " on laws." He then adds that Korban was a purely Jewish oath, which might be rendered " gift of God." Theophrastus flourished about 300 B.C. ; if, therefore, this quotation be genuine, the *Korban* vow must be of high antiquity ; the Rabbis are familiar with it, and declare that numerous euphemisms are in use for it, among them that very root KNM which we find in Phœnician inscriptions.

The formula quoted in the Lewisian text of Matthew is " Korban if thou be benefited by me " ; in the Greek of both Matthew and Mark " A gift, whatever benefit thou derive from me." If for " gift " we substitute the equivalent of *Korban, anathema,* clearly the sentence " anathema if thou be benefited by me " is a curse ; to utter such a sentence to a parent is to curse that parent, and so violate the commandment in Exodus xxi. 17. But if we ask the Rabbis what the words actually meant, we find that they no more knew than do we. The matter is discussed at length in the treatise on Vows (B. Nedarim 13a), where we learn that some vowed in the form Korban, others Like Korban, or The Korban, or To Korban. Those who, instead of using the word Korban, vowed by one of the sacrifices or by some of the sacrificial implements, really meant Korban. R. Jehudah thought the formula " Lo Korban " meant " by the life of Korban," Korban being the name of a god.

All, then, that we require to know is that the formula was a curse ; why then was not one who used this phrase to one of his parents to be executed ? Because one Menahem b. Jose inferred from Leviticus xxiv. 16 that execution was only incurred when the tetragrammaton was mentioned ; hence " the wise " permitted a son to say this to his father or mother.[2] But they also held that he was bound by his

[1] C. Apion, i. 22. [2] Shebuoth 35a.

vow; hence the Greek text of Matthew continues rightly "such a person must not honour his father (or mother)." The word "honour" means "bestow food, clothing, lodging and conveyance," necessarily forms of wealth, as was inferred from Proverbs iii. 8, where "Honour the LORD" is followed by "from thy substance."[1]

The charge then is quite clear. The Law forbids the cursing of parents on pain of death, and enjoins supplying them with food, etc. The Rabbinic inferences lead to the rejection of both these precepts; for if a man curse his parents by a formula in which the Divine Name is not mentioned, he will escape the punishment, and besides be prevented from giving his parents anything. That he is bound by a vow to do evil was inferred from Numbers xxx. 3; a vow to violate a commandmeut was binding, though an oath was not.[2] The case of a man using the formula to one of his parents is actually considered in the Mishnah, and the opinion of the majority was that the vow was binding.[3]

If the texts be examined in the light of the Mishnah, which happens in this case to be preserved so far as it is required, it will be found that the order is—

1. Original Hebrew Gospel.
2. Lewisian Syriac.
3. Greek of Matthew.
4. Greek of Mark.

The original Hebrew contained the quotation from Exodus in the form "he that curses father or mother"; this is blurred in the Peshiṭta of the Old Testament (quoted in the Lewisian Syriac) and the LXX (quoted in the Greek) by the euphemism "revile" for "curse."

[1] Kiddushin 38a.
[2] Nedarim 16a, b.
[3] Ibid. 64a.

In the Greek texts the Rabbis are said to annul the word of God by "your tradition"; Mark adds "which ye have handed down." The Syriac of Matthew, instead of "tradition," has *ordinance*; and clearly in this case we have not to do with a *tradition* but with inference and casuistry. Whatever may have been the original, the Syriac is nearer in sense to it than the Greek; and the addition in Mark (which ye have handed down) is of no help.

In the text of Matthew (Greek) the old rule is preserved, "he is not to 'honour' his father or mother"; Mark has "ye suffer him not to do anything to his father," etc. We have seen that the argument depends on the technical sense of the word "honour."

We may close with one characteristic case of the additions which the text of Mark makes to that of Matthew, where both go back to the intermediate Syriac Gospel.

In Matthew xxvi. 7 we read of a woman "having an alabastron of myron costly," ἔχουσα ἀλάβαστρον μύρου πολυτίμου. In Mark xiv. 3 it is "having an alabastron of myron nard pistic costly," ἀλάβαστρον μύρου νάρδου πιστικῆς πολυτελοῦς. The explanations given of "pistic" are too helpless to be quoted. Now what we learn from the Glossary of Bar Bahlul is that *nard* is a gloss on *myron*, and *pistic* a gloss on the original of *alabastron*. On *myron* he remarks, "*myron* and *nard* are the same plant." His gloss on *shāṭiftā* (Syriac for "alabaster") is *bista*, of which other varieties are *bistaka* and *pastaka*. The word is said to be of Persian origin; it means the same as *ampulla*, i.e. a flask. All then that Mark adds in this verse to the text of Matthew is a couple of glosses on two of the words in the Syriac text before him.

D. S. Margoliouth.

THE PASTORAL EPISTLES.

TO TITUS.

Chapter I.

(1) Paul a slave of (the) god and an envoy of Jesus (the) Messiah, in (the) faith of (the) selected ones of (the) god and (in the) knowledge of truth which is in accordance with piety (2) in hope of age-long life, which the truthful god promised before age-long periods of time began (3) and made manifest at his own good time, to wit his word by a proclamation with which I was entrusted by order of our preserver (the) god, (4) to Titus my own child in the faith we share: favour and peace (be to you) from (the) god (the) father and (the) Messiah Jesus our preserver.

(5) This is the reason why I left you behind in Crete, namely to put what is defective into a state of order, and to establish as elders in each city, in the manner in which I instructed you, (6) such men as are irreproachable, faithful to one woman, their children being Christian, and not chargeable with debauchery or insubordination. (7) The overseer, you know, ought to be irreproachable, seeing that he is (the) god's steward, not stubbornly self-willed, not given to outbursts of angry passion, not a toper, not a brawler, not greedy of base gain, (8) but instead a lover of foreigners, a lover of that which is good, prudent, just, pious, master of his appetites, (9) devoting himself to speech which is worthy of belief in proportion as it corresponds to the lesson (he himself has been) taught, that he may be able both to encourage (the weak) by this healthy teaching, and to refute those who dispute the truth of it. (10) There are many such, insubordinate, speakers of worthless words and self-deceivers, particularly belonging to the party of circumcision, (11) who must be silenced, the sort of people

who overturn whole households, teaching what is superfluous for the sake of base gain. (12) One from among them, a prophet of their own, said :—

Cretans (are) always liars, evil beasts of prey, (mere) lazy bellies.

(13) This testimony is true. For this reason reprove them sharply, that they may become healthy in their belief, (14) not devoting attention to Jewish tales and regulations made by fellows who turn their backs upon the truth. (15) All things are clean to the morally clean : but to the morally stained and the unfaithful nothing is clean, but both their reason and their consciousness have been stained. (16) They solemnly assert they know (the) god, but in their deeds they repudiate him, being loathsome and disobedient and quite useless for any good work.

Chapter II.

(1) But, as for you, do you utter what becomes the healthy teaching. (2) Let the old men be sober-minded, worthy of reverence, self-controlled, healthy in their faith, in their love and in their endurance : (3) let the old women, similarly, be in their demeanour as sacred persons, not slanderous, nor enslaved by much wine, (but) teachers of noble things, (4) that they may train the younger women to love their husbands and their children, (5) (to be) prudent, chaste, workers at home, good,[1] in a state of subordination to their own husbands, that the word of the god may not be spoken against. (6) Encourage the younger men similarly to control themselves : (7) in all things show yourself a model of noble deeds, (show) in your teaching soundness, gravity, (8) a word healthy (and) unimpeachable, that the adversary

[1] But the translator is one of those who regard the *ἀγαθάς* as too colourless by itself as it stands, and who would drop the comma before it, and translate "good housekeepers."

may feel ashamed seeing he has nothing evil to say about us. (9) Let slaves be in subjection to their own masters in everything, let them render willing service, and never utter objections, (10) or appropriate their masters' goods, but display all loyalty that is good, that they may honour in everything the teaching of our preserver (the) god. (11) For there has been manifested the grace of the god, as (that) which brings salvation for all men, (12) in that it trains us to repudiate irreverence (towards God) and worldly passions and live prudently and justly and piously in the present age, (13) expecting the happy hope and appearance of the glory of our great god and preserver (the) Messiah Jesus [1] who offered himself for our sakes that he might *set* us *free from all disobedience to the law* and *might purify for himself a people for his own possession*, (a people) that strives eagerly to do noble deeds. (15) This is the teaching to give: thus warn and reprove with complete authority: let no one ignore you (in future).

Chapter III.

(1) Remind them to subject themselves in obedience to powers and authorities, to be ready to perform every good deed, (2) to malign no one, to be peaceable, kindly and reasonable, displaying all (possible) gentleness to all men. (3) For we also were at one time senseless, disobedient, erratic, slaves to passions and various pleasures, spending our life in wickedness and envy, worthy to be hated, hating one another. (4) But when the goodness and the love-for-men of our preserver (the) god manifested itself, (5) not as the result of deeds which (as we thought) we had done in a state of righteousness but according to his own mercy he saved us through a bath of regeneration and of renewal of holy spirit, (6) which he poured out upon us in rich abundance through Jesus (the)

[1] I follow Hort (on *James* ii. 1) in the view that the Messiah is the glory.

Messiah our preserver, (7) in order that, having been made righteous by his favour we might become in hope heirs of everlasting life. (8) Reliable is the word, and with regard to these matters I wish you to make emphatic declarations, that those who have believed (the) god may be careful to lead the way in noble deeds. These are the things that are good and helpful for men : (9) but stand clear of foolish questionings and genealogies and strife and battles about law : for they are useless and vain. (10) A factious man cast off after admonishing him once or twice, (11) knowing that such a man is perverted and is a sinner, being as a matter of fact self-condemned.

(12) When I shall have sent Artemas to you or Tychicus, make an effort to come to me at Nicopolis : for there I have decided to spend the winter. (13) Be zealous in starting Zenas the lawyer and Apollos on their way, that they may lack nothing. (14) Let our friends also learn to lead the way in noble deeds, to meet all necessary needs, that they may not fail of results.

15. All my companions send their kind regards. Greet all that love us in (our common) faith.

Grace be with all of you.

Translated by Alex. Souter.

DR. ABBOTT'S MISCELLANEA EVANGELICA [1]

THE heading of the Second Chapter of Dr. Abbott's *Miscellanea* is as follows: *The disciple that was known unto the High Priest*, the author's purpose being to show that the reference in these words is not, as is generally supposed, to John, the son of Zebedee, but to Judas Iscariot, who had been for some days in communication with the Chief Priests and Pharisees, with regard to their plot against Jesus.

It seems to me that the wording of this allusion is very much opposed to such an explanation. I see no possible reason why he, who is in every Gospel described, over and over again, as the betrayer of Jesus into the hands of sinners, should here be represented as one who had done nothing to forfeit the friendship of the other disciples, though he had come straight from the garden of Gethsemane, bringing Jesus bound with him (John xviii. 12). How are we to reconcile this with John xviii. 15, ἠκολούθει δὲ τῷ Ἰησοῦ Πέτρος καὶ ἄλλος μαθητής? Imagine Peter, the most ardent and vehement of all the disciples, who had just used the sword against one of the High Priest's servants, selecting Judas as his companion to the Court where Jesus was to be tried, and accepting his help for admission into that court! But there is no need to argue the point. We read in Matthew xxvi. 37 f. that those who had taken Jesus (viz. Judas with his armed band) led Him away to the house of Caiaphas, but Peter followed Him afar off. Judas and Peter therefore were separated from each other by a wide interval.

Nor is this all: when St. John refers to a disciple without giving him a name, this anonymous use seems always to

[1] *Miscellanea Evangelica*, by E. A. Abbott, Hon. Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge; Fellow of the British Academy.

carry a peculiar meaning. It refers to what might be regarded as a special good action done by himself, or to some special privilege accorded to himself, though he prefers to leave in obscurity his personal connexion with it, much as St. Paul refuses to boast of being carried up to the third heaven. Thus, in the latter part of this verse, there is no attempt to contrast his own behaviour at the trial, to the disadvantage of Peter; while, on the other hand, he calls attention to the help he had himself received from his acquaintance with Caiaphas. Similarly in John i. 39 f. two of the Baptist's disciples are recommended to join themselves to "the Lamb of God." One of these is unnamed; the other is Andrew, who immediately enlists his own brother Simon among the followers of Jesus; it being understood that John was the first to give his own adhesion to the Lord, but that he himself thinks more highly of the action of the two brothers, Andrew and Peter, for immediately following his example. In John xiii. 21, after Jesus had said "One of you shall betray me," Peter asks the unnamed apostle, who was reclining on the Lord's breast, to inquire from Him who it was of whom He spoke. In John xix. 26 we read that Jesus, seeing His mother at the foot of the cross and the disciple standing by whom He loved, said to His mother, "Behold thy son," and to the disciple, "Behold thy mother"; and that from that hour that disciple took her unto his own home. Again, in chapter xx. 1 f., we are told that Mary Magdalene, when, on her early visit to the tomb, she found the stone rolled away, at once ran to tell Simon Peter, and the other disciple, whom Jesus loved; and this phrase, "the other disciple" is repeated thrice in the following verses. Again in the final chapter, we meet the phrase "the disciple that Jesus loved" in verses 7 and 20, while in verse 24 we are told that "this is the disciple that wrote these things."

Dr. Abbott thinks that the favourable sense attaching to the neutral phrase, "the other disciple," is due only to the supplementary adjunct, "whom Jesus loved"; so that we might seem to be at liberty to supply the name Judas Iscariot in chapter xviii. 15, after the words "another disciple." He finds a further difficulty in the meaning "known," which is given to γνωστός in the R.V. of this and the following verse: "Now that disciple was *known unto* the high priest, and entered in with Jesus into the court of the high priest; but Peter was standing at the door without. So the other disciple, which was *known unto* the high priest, went out and spake unto her that kept the door, and brought in Peter." And no doubt the second occasion of its use in this passage fails to convey the construction of the Greek, ὁ μαθητὴς ὁ ἄλλος, ὁ γνωστὸς τοῦ ἀρχιερέως where ὁ γνωστός is used as a substantive, meaning "the acquaintance," and is therefore followed by the genitive, not as before by the dative (γνωστὸς τῷ ἀρχιερεῖ).

We find two similar examples in Luke, one in ii. 44, where the mother of the child Jesus seeks for Him in vain on their return from Jerusalem, ἀνεζήτουν αὐτὸν ἐν τοῖς συγγενεῦσιν καὶ τοῖς γνωστοῖς, "They sought him among their kinsfolk and acquaintance"; the other in xxiii. 49, ἱστήκεισαν δὲ πάντες οἱ γνωστοὶ αὐτῷ ἀπὸ μακρόθεν, "All that were known to Him stood afar off." The other instances to be found in the New Testament, amounting to twelve in all, are taken from the Acts, except Romans i. 19, τὸ γνωστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, "That which may be known of God," and are used, not of persons, but of things, like τοῦτο ὑμῖν γνωστὸν ἔστω.

Dr. Abbott compares five verses in the Old Testament, in which he holds that γνωστός must be taken in the same sense which he ascribes to it in the verses from St. Luke and St. John, viz., "familiar friend," though neither of these epithets is implied in γνωστός. His quotations are

taken from Psalm lxxxviii. 8, translated in the A.V. "Thou hast put away mine acquaintance far from me"; and v. 18, "Lover and friend hast thou put far from me, and mine acquaintance into darkness" (Ps. lv. 13), *σύ δὲ ἄνθρωπε ἰσόψυχε, ἡγεμών μου καὶ γνωστέ μου*, where the R.V. has "It was even thou, a man mine equal, my companion, and my familiar friend." I agree that, in these cases, the translator uses the word *γνωστός* to represent the warm feeling of the original, for which the English has so good an equivalent in "familiar friend." But it would be difficult to find a more unsuitable word to express this warmth, than one that starts from the idea of knowledge without emotion, and that may be joined with hatred as easily as with affection. I do not see that Dr. Abbott's remaining quotations from the Old Testament get beyond this. One is taken from Psalm xxxi. 11, "I am become a reproach, yea unto my neighbours exceedingly, and a terror to mine acquaintance. They that did see me without fled from me." These words describe very well the treatment of lepers among the Jews, but, so far from implying friendship, we are told of those complained of in *v.* 13, that "they desired to take away my life." The other quotation is from 2 Kings, x. 11, where we read of Jehu's massacre of the house of Ahab, and of all his familiar friends (R.V.) and his priests. Here Dr. Abbott mentions that the A.V. has "kinsfolk," and the margin "acquaintances," either of which would suit better the unsparing fury of Jehu.

Turning back now to the Gospels I see no reason for supposing, with Dr. Abbott (p. 30), that we ought to read "a person in one's bosom," or "in one's counsels," rather than "acquaintance" in Luke ii. 44. It is very unlikely that all the people who were travelling back from Jerusalem were intimate friends. Inquiry would be made of every one, friend or not, provided they were travelling in the same

direction, with the same company. In like manner, who can say that either the apostle John, or Judas Iscariot, was really an intimate friend of Caiaphas? Nonnus, in his metrical paraphrase of the Gospel, endeavours to explain what was John's relation to Caiaphas, in the words quoted by Dr. Abbott in p. 24. I will give first his English quotation, and then the Greek of Nonnus so far as it bears on the question.

"So bearing Jesus with them the spearmen [1] flowed on,
And in his track went with them afar off Simon,
And a young man, another companion (of Christ), who from his trade of fishing
Being a friend renowned of the accustomed high priest,
Running with Christ, came within the God-receiving courtyard."

On the third and fourth lines Dr. Abbott has the following note:—"*Fishing*: This apparently refers to the occupation of John, the son of Zebedee. But how Nonnus supposed that this could make him 'A friend of the high priest,' I cannot even imagine.' [2]

The lines are:—

Καὶ νέος ἄλλος ἑταῖρος, ὃς ἰχθυβόλου παρὰ τέχνης
γνωτὸς ἐὼν ἀρίδηλος ἐθήμονος ἀρχιερῆος,
Χριστῷ σύνδρομος ἦλθεν ἔσω θεοδέγμονος αὐλῆς,

which I should translate, "And another, a young comrade, who, being from his trade of fishing, a well-known acquaintance of his customer, the high priest (literally 'the customary high priest') came hastening with Christ within the God-receiving court."

I see no difficulty in supposing that John, at any rate before he was called to be an apostle, might have carried about for sale fish caught in the sea of Tiberias, [2] whether this

[1] Better, perhaps, to use the general term "soldiers," since ἀσπίς means "shield," not "spear."

[2] "Among the Jews the contempt for manual labour did not exist. On the contrary it was esteemed a religious duty, and most earnestly

were tradition or merely conjecture on the part of Nonnus.[1] Jeremy Taylor in his *Life of Christ*, without naming any authority, gives another explanation of John's acquaintance with Caiaphas (vol. iii. p. 234, ed. Heber): "Having sold his possessions in Galilee to Caiaphas, he came and dwelt near Mount Sion, but was, by intervention of that bargain, made known to the high priest, and brought Peter into the house."

So far I have been occupied chiefly with the meaning of the phrase, "the other disciple," and the uses of γνωστός. I go on now to discuss Dr. Abbott's view as to the character and behaviour of the principal persons in the narrative, Judas, Caiaphas, John, Peter. Is it true that Judas was the familiar friend of Caiaphas and the intimate partaker of his counsels, as Dr. Abbott maintains on p. 30 ? The Gospels tell us plainly that he was merely the instrument employed by Caiaphas to carry out the design of the latter for the murder of Jesus. But there is no symptom of friendship on either side, unless we are prepared to call Banquo's murderers the familiar friends and counsellors of Macbeth ; and it is indeed a strange sharing of counsels that we read of, the moment the object of the conspirators has been attained. Caiaphas is naturally well pleased with the success of his scheme. All has passed off as it should do : there has been no tumult of the populace. The popularity of the pretended Messiah seems to have been the merest delusion ; only just enough left of it to excite the jealousy of Cæsar, and quiet the hesitation of the Roman Governor. Contrast with this what St. Matthew tells us of Judas in xxvii. 3–8.

insisted on, to learn some trade. The absence of wealth in no way implied social inferiority." Edersheim (*Life and Times of Christ*, vol. i. p. 252). So Paul continued his trade as a tent-maker after he had been called to be an apostle.

[1] In *Poli Synopsis* on John xviii. 5, the words "notus pontifici" are explained from Nonnus by the addition "ex arte sua piscatoria."

Early in the morning of Friday there had been another full meeting of the Sanhedrim at the palace of Caiaphas, where it was agreed that Jesus must be put to death, for which, however, the consent of Pilate was needed. Jesus was therefore taken to the praetorium, where the Jews, after vainly attempting to obtain from Pilate the power to crucify Him on their own authority, and afterwards on the charge of blasphemy, were finally driven to accuse Him of inciting the people against Cæsar, and to hint that Pilate himself could be no friend to Cæsar, if he refused to punish the enemies of Cæsar. Even then Pilate made two more efforts to save the prisoner in whom he could find no fault; he gave the people the choice between Jesus and Barabbas, and finally washed his hands of the shedding of this innocent blood.

St. Matthew tells us that "Judas, when he saw that Jesus was condemned, repented himself." What was this condemnation? Probably it was that first condemnation on the ground of blasphemy. But Judas may well have believed that the Roman Governor would not entirely forget the just rule of the Roman courts, and Pilate's reception of the Jewish accusers still held out hopes of acquittal. But when every shift had been tried in vain, when the people cried out in answer to Pilate, "His blood be on us and on our children," when Pilate delivered Him to be scourged and crucified, Judas felt that no further hope remained for *him*; that *he* must be the first to undergo the curse which his nation had called down on themselves and their children. He brought back the thirty pieces of silver to the chief priests and elders, and openly confesses that he could no longer endure to retain the price of innocent blood. The Jewish leaders of Church and State only mock at his repentance: "What is that to us? see thou to that." Judas on this threw down the money in the temple, and

went away and hanged himself. What a change during the twelve hours or so, which had passed since he led the servants and officers of these very men to arrest Jesus in the garden of Gethsemane. Then money seemed to be all in all; then the innocence of the victim appealed, as it would seem, not more to him than to the Pharisees. But now each incident of the passion recalled to him his first conviction that the long-looked-for Messiah had appeared upon earth. I think there is much to be said for the supposition that the leading motive of Judas was, not simply avarice, but impatience at the delay in the establishment of the Messiah's kingdom, which he, with the other disciples, and with his countrymen generally, expected to see triumphing over the Roman power. Judas may have thought that, if once the opposite forces were arrayed against each other, Jesus would make use of His miraculous power and fulfil the hope of Israel.

I venture to add here a quotation from Hogg's *Wider Hope*, p. 283.

"We are accustomed to look upon Judas Iscariot as the worst character brought before us in the Bible, and yet what a vast reserve of moral feeling is shown in the words, "I have sinned in that I have betrayed innocent blood," and in the desperate act by which, apparently without waiting for the last scene on Calvary, he tried to atone for his crime. If we may venture for a moment to carry on our thoughts to the meeting in Hades between the betrayer and the Betrayed: if we may presume to imagine the penetrating yet compassionate gaze—not less compassionate, surely, nor less love-compelling, than that which melted the heart of another less sorely wounded by Satan—is it not a moral certainty, from all we know of the laws of human nature, that out of the midst of that agony of shame and remorse there must have sprung up the consciousness of a love inexhaustible and invincible, which would make even the terrors of "his own place" not only endurable, but most welcome to the sufferer, when they were looked upon as the appointed remedy of his sin, the token of a Father's forgiveness to him who rightly received them? And yet, though we may see reason to believe that the sin of Judas has been forgiven, we shall not

think the language of Eastern hyperbole overstrained, when it says of one whose name was destined to be synonymous with 'traitor' till the end of time, "It were better for him if he had never been born."

I turn now to Peter, standing outside the door of the high priest's palace. How did he get there, and with whom? I have already pointed out the difficulties involved in the supposition that he came with Judas. There can be no doubt that, when Jesus forbade any further resistance, on the ground that prophecy must be fulfilled, all the disciples forsook Him and fled. It does not appear that they were pursued with any great activity, excepting the young man mentioned in St. Mark. It seems probable that the two leaders, Peter and John, would quickly meet and arrange to follow cautiously after Jesus. When they reached the court, John was admitted within, being recognised as an acquaintance of the high priest, while Peter had to wait till John could get leave for him to enter. I see no ground at all for supposing that John or Judas should have found it necessary to press Peter to come inside. Peter was always inclined to take the initiative, and would have been startled to hear John, or still more, Judas, addressing him in the words suggested by Dr. Abbott, "Do you not want to know, as I do, what they will do to the Master? You *must* want it. Then come in" (p. 19). It was no doubt rash in Peter to throw himself into the midst of those who had just brought Jesus bound into the court. It was also very rash for Peter to try to walk on the sea; but he did not wait for John to urge his doing so. If he had thought of his own safety, even if he had attended to the warning of his Master, he might have hidden himself where there was no chance of his being found. But to have done so would not have been like Peter or any true disciple. He had followed afar off thinking of nothing else but his imprisoned Master, and

how he might see Him to the end, whatever that end might be. (See Edersheim, vol ii. p. 550.)

Dr. Henry Latham, late Master of Trinity Hall, seems to me to have given a very true interpretation of Peter's behaviour in his *Pastor Pastorum*, p. 434 foll. :

"What Peter really feared was forcible separation from Christ. He was afraid that, if proved to be a follower of Jesus, he would be turned out of the judgment hall of Caiaphas. He would have said or done almost anything to avoid that. It was part of his nature to be mastered by the feeling that was uppermost. He clung to his Master's side with the instinctive fidelity of a Highland henchman to his chief. Thrice he might have gone away, but this he will on no account do. After being noticed he on each occasion moves away and returns only shifting his position. . . . It never occurred to Peter that in saying "I know not the man" he was being disloyal to the Master he loved. He wanted to keep sight of his Master and did not feel bound to speak the truth to a foe. One look of our Lord settles the matter ; it awakens the higher sense of truth, which had gone to sleep when the old instinct of the Oriental peasant, the habit of confronting authority with a flat denial, became dominant in Peter's breast. When the company of Apostles was scattered on their Master's apprehension, the strength they had drawn from association with Jesus vanished at once ; and then Peter dropped from the moral level of a disciple of Christ into the Galilean fisherman he had been before. He had been used to regard officials of Herod, or any ruling power, as his natural enemies, to whom he was not bound to speak the truth, and to this, his old self, he came back now. But though Peter's heart may have acquitted him of cowardly forsaking his Master—though he knew that he would, if need were, have gone with Him to prison and to death—yet he felt that this denial was in words—though only in words—a falling away from perfect loyalty ; it made clear to him, as it may have been meant to do, the weakness of his character in the way of yielding to impulse, and awakened floods of self-contempt ; he went out and wept bitterly."

I close with a quotation from the sixth chapter of my *Introduction* to the Second Epistle of Peter, in which I contrast the Peter of this Epistle with the Peter of the First Epistle, the Gospels, and the Acts (pp. cviii. to cx.).

Though capable of pondering over what was said to him, Peter more often spoke and acted on the spur of the moment at the prompting of his own generous heart. He was full of initiative, full of confidence, easily elated, but really humble, quick to own where he had been in the wrong, but never despairing; a reverent and devoted, yet a thoroughly free-spoken follower of his Master, as well as a loved and trusted leader of men. He is quick to lay his doubts and difficulties before Jesus: "How oft shall my brother sin against me and I forgive him?" On hearing the words "Whither I go, ye cannot come," he is the one to ask, "Whither goest Thou? Why cannot I follow Thee now?" He is not abashed or silent in presence of Moses and Elijah on the holy mount. He even ventures to rebuke Jesus when He foretold His approaching death, just after He had commended Peter's confession "Thou art the Son of God." His positiveness, combined with docility and readiness to be corrected and instructed, is seen in John xiii. 6, "Lord, dost *Thou* wash my feet? Thou shalt never wash my feet": and then, on hearing the explanation of Jesus, "Lord, not my feet only, but also my hands and my head." So in Acts x. 13 f., on hearing the voice, "Rise, Peter, kill and eat," he breaks out with "Not so, Lord; for I have never eaten anything that is common and unclean." But his behaviour to Cornelius shortly afterwards shows how thoroughly he had imbibed the spirit of the words, "What God has cleansed, make not thou common." His self-confidence is seen in such words as, "I will lay down my life for Thee," "Though all men should be offended, yet will not I," "Even if I must die with Thee, yet will I not deny Thee." Nor was this mere empty boasting. When the armed band of the chief priests appeared, he drew his sword and attacked them. How was it, then, that his courage so soon failed him? We must remember the circum-

stances of the case. A few days before, Jesus had entered Jerusalem in triumph amid the Hosannas of the multitude. He had spoken mysterious words about the coming of the Kingdom of God : He had warned His disciples to provide themselves with swords. But now He bids Peter put up his sword into its sheath : He tells His disciples to leave Him alone with the powers of darkness. And at the word they all forsook Him and fled, two only venturing to follow at a distance into the Judgment Hall. Under these circumstances, is it right to regard the denial as proving timidity in Peter ? Is Elijah to be called timid because he fled from Jezebel, and was for a brief space inclined to despair of the triumph of right ? Both Elijah and Peter were suffering from reaction : the spirit was willing, but the flesh was weak. It is as if soldiers whose courage had been strained to the highest pitch at the prospect of leading a forlorn hope were suddenly told that their captain had changed his mind, and that they were now to surrender to the enemy. Despair and bewilderment would succeed to high-wrought courage, and so it was with Peter. But one look of his Master's was sufficient to recall him to himself. His deep repentance was followed by no false shame on his own part, and by no reproaches on the part of his fellow-disciples. He is the one to whom the Magdalene first brings the news of the empty tomb. He and John are the first of the apostles to visit the tomb. At the sea of Tiberias we find Peter as usual taking the initiative, and the others as usual following, " I go a fishing," " We also go with thee." Impetuous as ever, on hearing that it was " the Lord " who had foretold the miraculous draught of fishes, Peter leaps into the sea and makes his way to Jesus on the shore. One phrase, in our Lord's colloquy with him, suggests his energetic, independent character : " When thou wast young, thou walkedst whither thou wouldest." The question about John, which

followed immediately afterwards, shows how quickly he resumed his usual tranquility and his thought for his friends.

J. B. Mayor.

EXEGETICA.

Matthew v. 39.

ὅστις σε ῥαπίζει εἰς τὴν δεξιὰν σιαγόνα [*σου*], *στρέψον αὐτῷ καὶ τὴν ἄλλην.*

Why the "right" cheek? When one man attacks another, his right hand generally strikes the left cheek of his opponent. Why does Jesus mention that the first blow falls on the left cheek, then? Because, Professor J. Weismann suggests (*Zeitschrift für die neutest. Wissenschaft* 1913, pp. 175–176), the blow is inflicted with the back of the hand, not with a clenched fist or with the palm of the hand. It is a blow which means insult rather than injury. He points out that in Talmudic law a blow of this kind was specially punished, quoting from the tractate *Baba qama fol.* 90*a* to show that the fine for it was double that inflicted on a blow of the other kind. Professor Weismann wonders if this relative estimate was not current as early as the days of Jesus. At any rate, he points out that such an interpretation gives a natural and vivid meaning to the words *στρέψον καὶ τὴν ἄλλην*, for, unless the victim and the contemptuous blow turned his face, it would not be easy for the scorner to strike him on the left cheek with the back of his right hand.

Mark vi. 40.

Καὶ ἀνέπεσαν πρασιαὶ πρασιαὶ, κατὰ ἑκατὸν καὶ κατὰ πεντήκοντα.

Lagrange's note on *π. π.* is: "C'est ainsi qu'à Iabnè les

savants étaient rangés שורות שורות comme dans une vigne (*j. Ber.* iv. 7*d.* ob.)." In an essay in *Lewy-Festschrift* (1912), p. 22, Dr. S. Krauss, of Vienna, claims to show that the assemblies of rabbis were actually open-air meetings. The "comme" might be omitted. These gatherings, Dr. Krauss argues, were held often "in vineyards, where the sitting in rows was a natural consequence. In the open field such an arrangement of seats is called *πρασιαὶ πρασιαὶ* (Mark vi. 40), in Hebrew ערוגות ערוגות." In the *Jewish Quarterly Review* (July, 1913, pp. 111–114) he finds a third expression for this custom, also in the form of an iterated word. It occurs in a midrashic comment on Cant. viii. 13 ("thou that dwellest in the gardens, the companions hearken to thy voice; cause me to hear it"), where the obscure גנוניות גנוניות is interpreted by Dr. Krauss as the reduplicated plural from a formation based on גנוניתא or גינוניתא, meaning in Aramaic or Syriac "a little garden." The sense of the midrashic comment is that to the חברים or "companions," who sit there in the form of small gardens [i.e. arranged in classes or rows], indulging in the study of the Law, God descends, listens to their voice, and hears them.

The phrase *π. π.* only occurs in Mark, and in the light of this rabbinic explanation it is tempting to connect it with another Marcan touch in ver. 35: *καὶ ἤρξατο διδάσκειν αὐτοὺς πολλά.* But it is not said that the five thousand grouped themselves *π. π.* in order to listen to Jesus as a rabbi. The arrangement in rows or groups was for the immediate and later purpose of feeding.

Luke xxii. 44.

καὶ γενόμενος ἐν ἀγωνίᾳ ἐκτενέστερον προσηύχετο. καὶ ἐγένετο ὁ ἱδρὼς αὐτοῦ ὡσεὶ θρόμβοι αἵματος καταβαίνοντος ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν.

In the *Classical Review* (September, 1913, p. 194) Mr. W. R. Paton proposes to translate *ἀγωνία* here by " acute anxiety " (as in Modern Greek : the French, " inquiétude "). " Agony," he thinks, calls up associations of extreme pain which are foreign to the context. The word " is, of course, originally the anxiety of a runner in a race before the start." If it is rendered " agony " in Luke's paragraph, it is apt to suggest " the wrong notion, owing to its associations with acute and paralysing physical or mental pain. That which Christ suffered was exactly *φόβος ἐπὶ ἀδήλου πράγματος*,[1] as He did not know how his prayer would be answered." It follows from this that there was no *ἀγωνία*, in the strict Greek sense, upon the Cross ; " the cup had been drunk, the race had been won," by that time. In Gethsemane, on the other hand, there was a real " agony of uncertainty or expectation."

The rendering obviously depends upon the exact shade of meaning. Now *ἀγωνία* meant fear rather than uncertainty, as Dr. Field showed in his note. Thus, when Servius is explaining " dum trepidat " in Verg. *Aen.* xii. 737, he paraphrases by " dum turbatur, festinat, quod Graeci *ἐν ἀγωνίᾳ ἐστίν*." No doubt, fear and uncertainty are closely allied, but it is not so here. The *ἀγωνία* was not a dread, an agony of uncertainty, about the answer to His prayer ; it was rather the terror of a death which He felt to be imminent. As Jesus felt it was the will of the Father that the cup of death should be drunk by Him, He fell into *ἀγωνία*— not because he was uncertain of the approaching issue, but because He was certain of it.

If this is so, the exact rendering would be something like " terror," and possibly the sense of this meaning may have been one of the reasons which led to the omission of the paragraph by some circles in the later church. The English

[1] The Stoic definition in Diog. Laert. vii. 113.

equivalent or transliteration, "agony," which goes back to Wiclif, may be misleading linguistically, but after all it is a word which is coloured by the context in any given case, and it is doubtful whether it does suggest extreme physical pain to most readers or hearers of the Lucan passage. They know the "agony" was not physical but mental, and this knowledge prevents them from misunderstanding.

Besides, does "agony" in English literature invariably connote physical pain? I doubt it. At the moment I can only recall Matthew Arnold's description of Byron's cry:—

> "Stormily sweet, his Titan-agony,"

or of Philomela's note resounding

> "With love and hate, triumph and agony,"

Coleridge's

> "Oh, thou maid divine,
> I loved to agony,"

or Wordsworth's famous lines—

> "Thy friends are exultations, agonies,
> And love and man's unconquerable mind."

In none of these is the physical idea prominent, even if it is present at all to the mind of the writer. I think, then, that "agony" is not a misleading term for the Greek word in this passage.

Luke xxiii. 34.

Πάτερ, ἄφες αὐτοῖς· οὐ γὰρ οἴδασιν τί ποιοῦσιν.

A fresh witness to this text has turned up in the commentary of Oecumenius on the Apocalypse. In the *American Journal of Philology* (1913, pp. 300–313) Mr. H. C. Hoskier calls attention to one Messina manuscript of the commentary, in view of the critical edition which Professor

Deikamp is preparing. It appears that Oecumenius quotes this saying of Jesus, adding that it was current or authoritatively announced (*εἴρηται παρ' ἡμῖν*), in spite of Cyril's statement in his thirteenth book against Julian. Cyril evidently denied the existence of the saying in the Gospel. Oecumenius in turn denies this, and his denial is a proof that the saying did exist in the church-text of his period or circle.

On the other hand, Herr A. Kahrstedt (in *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie*, 1913, 395 f.) appears to imply that it was not current in the second century text of the Gospel. He is discussing the Acts of the Lugdunum martyrs—which, by the way, he values highly as a historical document. When he comes to Eus. v. 2, 8 (" they prayed, like Stephen the perfect martyr, ' Lord, lay not this sin to their charge ' "), he observes that Acts vii. 60 is quoted, because no corresponding word from the cross was known. This is not a necessary inference, however. It hardly proves that the gospel saying was absent from the tradition or books known to the martyrs. The words of Stephen, a human martyr, may have seemed more appropriate to human martyrs than any words of the Lord Himself.

Acts xvi. 25.

Κατὰ δὲ μεσονύκτιον Παῦλος καὶ Σίλας προσευχομενοι ὕμνουν τὸν θεόν.

In his recent commentary Windisch quotes a parallel from the Testament of Joseph (viii. 5), which describes Joseph rejoicing in prison. But he rejoices because even imprisonment is preferable to the temptations of Potiphar's wife. A closer parallel is to be found in the words of Epictetus (ii. 6, 26 f.) upon the duty of remaining undismayed even in prison or exile : *Καὶ τότ' ἐσόμεθα ζηλωταὶ Σωκράτους, ὅταν ἐν φυλακῇ δυνώμεθα παιᾶνας γράφειν.* There

is a couplet in Tibullus (ii. 6, 25–26) which verbally resembles this :—

> "Spes etiam valida solatur compede vinctum :
> Crura sonant ferro, sed canit inter opus."

But this seems to mean either his hope of finishing his task or his expectation of gaining freedom. In the latter case, it would be a partial parallel to 1 Cor. vii. 21.

Rom. xiii. 13.

μὴ κώμοις καὶ μέθαις, μὴ κοίταις καὶ ἀσελγείαις, μὴ ἔριδι καὶ ζήλῳ.

A contemporary parallel for this collocation of vices may be found in the lines of Petronius, quoted by Fulgentius (*Mythologiae* ii. 6). Petronius, in speaking of the vulture which gnawed the liver of Prometheus, explains that it means inward vice—"cordis mala, livor atque luxus."

1 Cor. xi. 10.

διὰ τοὺς ἀγγέλους.

Why did Paul order women at Corinth to wear a covering on their heads during public worship? In *The Quest* (October, 1913, pp. 90–101) Mr. E. E. Kellett proposes a new explanation of the regulation. He takes *ἀγγέλους* in the sense of good angels; otherwise, we should have had a qualifying adjective. Then he explains that the veil was worn to avert unhallowed desires on the part of the men, since these desires would awaken the jealous rage of the watchful angels who loved the women. The veil was worn as a protection against men, but *διὰ τοὺς ἀγγέλους*, since the feelings of the latter had to be considered. In proof of this startling theory he asserts that it is certain, during early Christian times, that holy angels fell in love with women, "as the gods of heathenism loved a Danaë

or an Europa"; but the evidence adduced is both late and dubious. There is, of course, the legend of St. Cecilia, which is perhaps the closest parallel, but it seems more than doubtful whether "the main belief, or almost the main belief, of the first two centuries with regard to marriage was that all Christian women had, by the mere fact of accepting Christianity, surrendered themselves to divine or angelic husbands, and that, therefore, marriage with a mere man was void." The context of Paul's reference shows that the veil was worn for the very purpose of emphasising the marriage-right of the husband, and this corroborates the other view that the angels are viewed as evil rather than good, and that it is their wicked, erotic passions against which precautions are to be taken.

2 Cor. ii. 17.

ὡς οἱ πολλοὶ καπηλεύοντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ.

Cp. *Vita Apollonii* i. 13 (the rebuke addressed by Apollonius to Euphrates) *ἀπῆγε τοῦ χρηματίζεσθαι τε καὶ τὴν σοφίαν καπηλεύειν.*

Eph. v. 18.

μὴ μεθύσκεσθε οἴνῳ, ἐν ᾧ ἐστιν ἀσωτία.

In the light of Test. Jud. xvi. 1 (*ἔστιν γὰρ ἐν αὐτῷ* [*οἴνῳ*] *τέσσαρα πνεύματα πονηρά· ἐπιθυμίας, πυρώσεως, ἀσωτίας καὶ αἰσχροκερδίας*, cp. Test. Asher v. 1) we must translate *ἀσωτία* here by "profligacy." The thought is, that drunkenness leads to sexual vice, not that the use of wine is apt to lead to an excessive use of it. Hence Boswell's remorseful application of the passage to himself (*The Journal of a Tour to the Hebrides*, Sept. 26) is true to the English rather than to the meaning of the Greek text.

Eph. v. 26.

ἵνα αὐτὴν ἁγιάσῃ καθαρίσας τῷ λουτρῷ τοῦ ὕδατος ἐν ῥήματι.

In an essay on baptism in the New Testament (*Studien u. Kritiken*, 1914, pp. 44 f.) Herr G. Kittel feels himself obliged to have recourse to conjectural emendation, in order to explain this difficult passage. He conjectures *αἵματι* for *ῥήματι*. The conjecture had been already made, not only by Venema (as he found out subsequently), but by van de Sande Bakhuyzen.

Heb. xiii. 17.

ὡς λόγον ἀποδώσοντες.

Chrysostom (*de Sacerdotio* iii. 18, cp. vi. 1) uses this passage to enforce a sense of responsibility upon Christian ministers: *εἰ γὰρ τῶν οἰκείων πλημμελημάτων εὐθύνας ὑπέχοντες φρίττομεν, ὡς οὐ δυνησόμενοι τὸ πῦρ ἐκφυγεῖν ἐκεῖνο, τί χρὴ πείσεσθαι προσδοκᾶν τὸν ὑπὲρ τοσούτων ἀπολογεῖσθαι μέλλοντα.* But the writer of Hebrews assumes that the *ἡγούμενοι* are doing and will do their duty. The sadness which may come over them as they render their final account is not the result of their own shortcomings; it is due to the wilfulness of their charges.

James Moffatt.

ST. PAUL AND THE CONCEPTION OF THE "HEAVENLY MAN."

In a review of Brückner's well-known book, *Die Entstehung der paulinischen Christologie*, Heitmüller remarks: "I cannot admit that the idea of the Heavenly Man plays so fundamental a part [in Paul's theology] as the writer assumes. Here, no doubt, I assail an opinion which has almost become a dogma." Since these words were written (*Theol. L.Z.*, sp. 353, 1905), the dogma in question has become even more firmly established. It has taken a prominent place in many discussions of early Christianity. But it is perhaps worth while to isolate it from the larger Christological investigations of which it has formed part, and to attempt to estimate it on its own account.

In any such endeavour, two questions must, as far as possible, be kept separate. We may ask: What place does the idea of the Heavenly Man occupy in Paul's religious thought, viewed generally? And we may also enquire: To what extent does it implicitly influence his conception of Christ? A good deal of confusion has, I think, surrounded each of these inquiries.

Let us begin with the more general question. It is no exaggeration to say that the ordinary intelligent reader of Paul's Epistles would scarcely conclude that the Apostle is accustomed to think of Jesus Christ as the Heavenly Man. He loves to speak of Him as the "Son of God" and the "Lord." He thinks of Him predominantly as the Crucified and the Risen. He constantly refers to Him as the Redeemer

of men, who in great lowliness stooped to save them, and he uses various phrases to express the idea. In several passages Christ is virtually identified with the Spirit. One has no hesitation in asserting that these conceptions embrace Paul's favourite representations of Jesus of Nazareth, in whom he has been compelled to acknowledge the Messiah of God.

In two passages, from differing standpoints, Paul draws a comparison, which is really a contrast, between Adam and Jesus. In the first of these, Romans v. 12–21, Adam, the parent of humanity, is viewed as the originator of human sinfulness, which has brought death upon the race. In the light of *vv.* 13, 14, it is plain that for the thought of the Apostle, Adam's transgression implicated all his descendants. It is not of moment for the present discussion to ask what this actually meant for Paul. It is enough to recognise that the human race is regarded as tainted by sin from its very beginning. Over against this baneful heritage, which goes back to Adam, the Apostle sets the gift of righteousness, which comes to humanity through the one Man, Jesus Christ. The entire significance of the comparison (or contrast) appears in verse 19 : " As through the disobedience of the one man the many were constituted sinners, so also through the obedience of the one the many shall be constituted righteous." Plainly, the references in this passage of Romans to Jesus Christ as " the one man " have simply in view the fact that He lived a human life, whose culmination in the death of the Cross Paul regards as the special channel of blessing for men. The whole paragraph must be read in the light of that which precedes it, v. 1–11. There, special emphasis is laid upon Christ's death for the ungodly (*vv.* 6, 8, 10), and the issue is shown to be salvation for all who through that death have been brought into right relations with God. I cannot find that any important fact

of redemption is adduced by the comparison between Christ and Adam. I am unable to agree with those scholars who discover here a peculiar importance attached by Paul to a racial act of Christ. The description of those who benefit by what Christ has done is surely in no sense racial: "they who receive the abundance of the grace and of the gift of righteousness shall reign in life." These are the same persons as those designated "justified" and "reconciled" in the earlier part of the chapter. And Paul makes it plain that justification and reconciliation belong solely to faith. Accordingly, there is nothing in this comparison to exercise any dominant influence on Paul's conception of the function of Jesus Christ. He does not here speak of Him as the Second Adam. No stress is laid upon the idea of the Founder of a new humanity. It is possible, of course, to deduce that notion from the Apostle's statements, but it does not seem to possess any special normative value for him.

The great discussion of the Resurrection in 1 Corinthians xv. is the only other context in which a similar comparison is to be found. It is introduced, to begin with, in a very casual fashion, and immediately dropped. At this point it has no important bearing on the argument. Paul has just made this triumphant statement which sums up his previous reasoning: "But now is Christ risen from the dead, the firstfruits of them that have fallen asleep" (ver. 20). And then he is struck by the analogy: "For seeing that through man came death, through man also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, so also in Christ shall all be made alive." What "all" means in the second clause is made perfectly clear by the very next verse (23), where it is defined as "they that are Christ's at his coming." Here, again, there is no suggestion of any racial experience. This "being made alive" is the privilege of those who are united to Christ by faith.

The comparison is resumed when Paul discusses the nature of the resurrection-body. The culmination of the contrast between that which is buried and that which is raised is expressed in the words: "It is sown a natural body (*σῶμα ψυχικόν*), it is raised a spiritual body (*σῶμα πνευματικόν*)." The antithesis between the fleshly organism and that which is the vehicle of the perfected spirit prompts the Apostle to linger for a moment on the subject. Hence he continues: "If there is a natural body, there is also a spiritual." As is his wont, he seeks confirmation for his position in the Old Testament: "So it is written, 'the' first 'man' Adam 'became a living soul (*ψυχὴν ζῶσαν*),' the last Adam became a life-giving spirit." This is the only instance of his use of the designation, "the last Adam." It is nothing short of absurd to assert, as some scholars do, that Paul meant his readers to infer that the statement about "the last Adam" formed part of his quotation from Scripture. The assertion is made to associate the Apostle's position with that of Philo. The latter, as is well known, builds a theory on the two references to the creation of man which occur in Genesis, namely, i. 26 and ii. 7. In his *Legg. Alleg.* I. § 31 (ed. Cohn and Wendland) he affirms: "There are two types of men, the one is heavenly, the other earthly. The heavenly, inasmuch as he has been made after the image of God (*κατ' εἰκόνα θεοῦ*, Gen. i. 26, LXX), has no part at all in corruptible and earthly essence, but the earthly was formed out of scattered material, which Scripture calls dust" (*χοῦν*, Gen. ii. 7, LXX). Now Philo distinctly declares that the heavenly or ideal man was created first, and afterwards the earthly (*De Opif. Mundi*, § 134). We are at once struck by the contrast between this idea and that expressed by Paul, who sets the "last Adam" over against the "first." But, to show what is the particular feature which he wishes to emphasise, he adds: "Not first

came the spiritual [body] but the natural, thereafter the spiritual." The statement reveals his purpose in introducing the comparison at all. It is not the *general* contrast between the first Adam and the last that interests him. It is that between the earthly organism of the progenitor of the race and the spiritual organism belonging to the glorified Man who has become "life-giving spirit." Only a distortion of the facts can find in this description of Christ a reference to His pre-incarnate existence. The passage is occupied exclusively with the nature of the resurrection-body. So when he proceeds: "The first man was from the earth, made of dust (χοϊκός), the second man is from heaven," he is not concerned with the general contrast between them but with the fact that Adam and Christ belong to two different spheres, a fact which has a direct bearing on the equipment of those descendants of Adam who have come into relation with Christ. His language is terse and compressed: "As is the earthly [man, χοϊκός], such also are the earthly [those who have entered upon no higher relationship], and as is the heavenly [man, ἐπουράνιος], such also are the heavenly [those united to Christ]." But his purpose is disclosed by the culminating section of the paragraph: "And just as we bore the image (εἰκόνα) of the earthly, we shall also bear [reading φορέσομεν instead of φορέσωμεν] the image of the heavenly." It is the new mode of being which engrosses his attention. And the remainder of the discussion (*vv.* 50–54) expresses in triumphant language his conviction that "this mortal must put on immortality."

Even a brief examination of the two crucial passages seems to show that the comparison (or contrast) between Adam and Christ is not a question of any theological moment for St Paul, but rather an impressive illustration calculated to vivify for his readers truths so central for his religious thought as Christ's death for men and the nature of the

future glorified existence as pledged by the experience of the glorified Lord Himself. Hence, when he speaks of "the one man, Jesus Christ," in Romans v., or of "the last Adam" and the "second man" in 1 Corinthians xv., we are not at liberty to make any inferences as to his view of the pre-incarnate Son of God, in whom he believes. He has obviously before his mind the historical Jesus in His human history, that history which has been the scene of what, for the Apostle, are His supreme experiences as Redeemer, His death on the Cross, and His resurrection to a glorified life.

If may therefore be said without hesitation that the figure of the Heavenly Man, as a description of Jesus in His pre-incarnate condition, does not at least appear on the surface of Paul's religious thinking. The Apostle values Jesus' humanity for many reasons: chiefly, perhaps, as an evidence of His unfathomable love for sinful men. It supplies the real background for his thoughts concerning the exalted Lord who had taken hold of his life and transformed it. But he does not even approximate to the intensity of feeling with which the writer to the Hebrews emphasises the one-ness of Jesus as man with His brethren. He is far more concerned with the relation of believers to their exalted Lord, or with that of the Church, which is His body, to Christ, her glorified Head.

Accordingly, I cannot see much ground in the Pauline Epistles for making the conception of the Last Adam or the Heavenly Man the regulating factor in the Christology of the Apostle. It is possible, by ingenuity, to arrange his leading ideas under such a category, but there are many others which present themselves far more spontaneously, as springing directly out of the crucial experience of his conversion and the reflexion upon it which inevitably followed. Paul prefers to set forth Christ as the Son of God

who loved him and gave Himself for him, or as the exalted Lord, whose spirit as the spirit of sonship creates new life in the soul of the believer.

So much for the first question which was suggested at the beginning of this study. The second is of a more elusive character, and rests on a series of bolder hypotheses. We may begin by asking: "Is there any clear evidence in the Epistles that Paul regarded the *pre-existent* Christ as the 'Heavenly Man'?" The only passage which claims careful consideration is that which was last examined in its more general bearings. It has been shown that the statement, "the last Adam was made a life-giving spirit," cannot refer to the original condition of Christ, for the "life-giving" has in mind the assimilation of believers to the living Lord in His self-manifestation as energising Spirit. It is His new condition as Lord (κύριος), that which Paul describes in Romans i. 4 as "determined to be Son of God in power according to the spirit of holiness as the result of resurrection from the dead," which is imaged before his mind. That condition he explicitly distinguishes from his conception of the pre-existent Christ in Philippians ii. 6–11. A new factor has entered into the situation, and that factor is the result of His human experience. "Wherefore God highly exalted him and gave him the name which is above every name" (Phil. ii. 9). As man, Jesus possessed a σῶμα ψυχικόν, a "natural" organism. As conqueror of death through the Divine power He is clothed with a σῶμα πνευματικόν, a "spiritual" organism. There is no suggestion as to possession of a σῶμα in His pre-existence.

At first sight the hypothesis may appear to have some foundation in 1 Corinthians xv. 47, which belongs to the context we have just discussed: "The first man is from the earth (γῆς), made of dust (χοϊκός), the second man is from heaven (ὁ δεύτερος ἄνθρωπος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ)." What does this

last clause precisely mean? It must be interpreted in the light of its setting, and that is Paul's endeavour to show that, in the case of believers the "natural" body, consisting of flesh and blood, and belonging to them as members of the race of Adam, who according to the Genesis-story was formed from the dust of the earth, will be exchanged for or transformed into a "spiritual" body, in virtue of their relation to the living Christ, who Himself is invested with a "spiritual" body. What the process means is explicitly described in Philippians iii. 20, 21: "Our commonwealth is in heaven, whence also we eagerly look for the Lord Jesus Christ as Saviour, who shall transform the body of our humiliation into the form of the body of his glory, according to that energy by which he is able even to subdue all things to himself." This spiritual condition is to come after the natural. As the father of the race, himself "made of dust" (χοϊκός), was responsible for our first type of σῶμα, the Lord and Giver of Life is responsible for the second. He is the *fons et origo* of the new creation (cf. 2 Cor. v. 17). As such, He is designated by Paul ὁ δεύτερος ἄνθρωπος. There is no reference here to His pre-existence. It is even questionable if the Apostle has His earthly experience at all in view. The whole emphasis is laid on the kind of nature which belongs to Him as the source and medium of life to believers. He is ἐξ οὐρανοῦ. That this is meant to describe the quality of His being is plain from the fact that in the very next sentence He is called ὁ ἐπουράνιος. Indeed, if it were legitimate to press the phrase ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, we should be compelled to interpret it in the light of such passages as Philippians iii. 20, quoted above. For the very function of Christ with which Paul is concerned in our passage is there directly connected with His coming ἐξ οὐρανοῦ. Hence it is impossible to base any conclusion as to Paul's conception of a "Heavenly Man" on 1 Corinthians xv. 47.

But another aspect of the discussion is associated with the very texture of Paul's conception of Christ. Most scholars have been accustomed to approach that conception by way of the Apostle's conversion-experience. It is, indeed, difficult to reconstruct the picture of supra-sensible realities by which he represented to himself the living Christ. The most concrete description he gives of the crisis is found in two passages in 1 Corinthians. In chapter ix. 1, when defending the independence of his apostleship, he exclaims: "Have not I seen (ἑόρακα) Jesus our Lord?" In chapter xv. 8, after recounting the post-resurrection appearances of Jesus to various disciples and groups of disciples, he concludes: "last of all . . . he appeared (ὤφθη) also to me." These statements obviously imply an event which somehow impressed his sense-perceptions. In others, a different phase of the occurrence is emphasised. Thus, in Galatians i. 15, he says: "When it pleased God . . . to reveal His Son in me (ἐν ἐμοί)." Closely akin is 2 Corinthians iv. 6: "It is the God who said, Light shall shine out of darkness [Gen. i. 3], who shone in our hearts to illuminate us with the knowledge of the glory of God (τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ) in the face of Christ." And yet the term δόξα used here links the former passages to this. For it is probable that it usually connotes for Paul a manifestation of the being of God which has something of a sensible as well as a purely spiritual side. Now we have already seen that the risen Christ was for the Apostle pre-eminently πνεῦμα ζωοποιοῦν. The revelation of such a Being must be made on "pneumatic" lines. It is therefore almost inevitable to suppose that Paul explained the experience to himself by means of the idea of the σῶμα πνευματικόν, the "spiritual organism," which he postulates for believers in virtue of their connexion with the risen Christ, who is to transfigure their earthly σώματα into the nature of His own σῶμα, whose quality is δόξα.

Several recent investigators, however, such as Wrede, Brückner, and Johannes Weiss, have transferred the emphasis from Paul's conversion to what they call the "Messianic dogmatic" with which he was intimately acquainted in his pre-Christian days. This Messianic theology, they allege, had its focus in the figure of a heavenly Being, a superhuman Man, an eschatological creation of Jewish Apocalyptic, involved in the catastrophic conception of the Kingdom of God. He represents the new type of Messiah which has replaced the old, a transcendental Person who is to inaugurate the new Age. As the result of Paul's conviction—a conviction finally shaped in the crisis on the Damascus road—that Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah, the theological construction of his Pharisaic period is fitted to the person of Jesus. Thereby, a history of salvation is formulated. Jesus is the Heavenly Man. His human life is for Paul no more than an episode. All his thoughts of Him, whether as pre-existent or post-existent, are determined by the original dogma of Messiah which was central for his pre-Christian theology.

It is impossible to avoid asking the question: What data do we possess for reconstructing the so-called Messianic dogmatic? Is there any cogent evidence extant? Is there a consistent tradition which may be used as normative? An examination of the existing material reveals the most conflicting phenomena. In some of the documents, the idea of a personal Messiah is prominent. But even there the pictures portrayed are quite irreconcilable. In that section of *Enoch* known as the Similitudes (chapp. xxxvii.–lxxi.) he appears as an obscure eschatological figure, pre-existing with God, described by a variety of names, "Son of Man," "Elect," "Anointed," "Righteous One." It is natural to connect the first of them with Daniel vii. 13 ff., which, however, does not really contain the description of a person

but the symbol of a kingdom, designated in the same context the "kingdom of the saints." It is no more possible to describe this Messiah of the Similitudes as a Heavenly Man than to use such a term of the God in whose presence He is found, who had "a head of days . . . white as wool" (*Enoch* xlvi. 1). When we pass to the *Psalms of Solomon*, written some years later, about the middle of the first century, B.C., the portrait of Messiah is wholly different. It is no longer a pre-existent Being who is to vindicate the Divine purpose. He is to rule on earth, a King made strong by the Holy Spirit of God, free from sin and wise in counsel. Through the fear of God He shall guide His people in works of righteousness. In the *Assumption of Moses* and the *Secrets of Enoch*, each of them assigned to the opening years of the Christian era, there is no mention of a Messiah at all. When, however, we descend to the era following the destruction of Jerusalem, we find in the *Apocalypse of Baruch* and *Fourth Ezra* two Messianic pictures, in various respects akin, in which a personal Figure is again prominent. In the former, a powerful Messiah, who has humbled all that is on earth, is represented as sitting on the throne of his kingdom, and establishing joy and peace and health. Strangely enough, it is said that his rule will last until the world, doomed to destruction, comes to an end (chap. xl. 3). The delineation in *Fourth Ezra* is more difficult to estimate. The Messiah is a transcendental being, seen by Ezra in vision emerging out of the sea, "like the appearance of a man" (*tanquam similitudinem hominis*, xiii. 3 : so Syr. : overlooked in the Latin text because the beginning of two consecutive sentences was the same). He is preserved by the Highest for the end of the days (xii. 32). He is described as "My Son, the Messiah" (vii. 28). He will reveal Himself, and give joy to those who survive [the earlier calamities] for 400 years. After these years He will die, as well

as all who have the breath of man. The evidence of this apocalypse is rendered more complex by traces of Christian redaction and interpolation, the limits of which it is hard to determine.

The brief survey which has been given is sufficient to indicate that we cannot speak of a regular "Messianic dogmatic," current in the Pharisaic Schools, with which Paul was familiar as a student of the Rabbis, and which remained central for his religious thought. Often, as in *Enoch* and *Fourth Ezra*, it is difficult to distinguish between symbol and thing signified. Often, the picture of Messiah changes within the compass of a single document. There is nothing even approximating to a normal dogma. We move here in the region of fantastic vision. To reduce its symbolism to theological prose seems entirely irrelevant.

Nor is it helpful to look for light on the elusive figure of the "Son of Man" in *Enoch* or on the "Man" rising out of the sea in *Fourth Ezra*, in the speculations regarding the "original man" which have been handed down in various writings of the Graeco-Roman period. It is true that in certain Hellenistic documents which cannot be accurately dated, such as the so-called "Naassene Discourse," most skilfully disentangled from its Christian setting as found in Hippolytus by Reitzenstein (*Poimandres*, pp. 83–98), we come upon a quasi-deity ἄνθρωπος or ἀρχάνθρωπος, who is associated with cosmogonic myths, and apparently represents the medium of contact between the highest God and the material world. Philo is acquainted with the tradition, and identifies the ἄνθρωπος θεοῦ with the Logos (*De Confus. Ling.*, 411, ed. M). Bousset has, with extraordinary patience, tracked out the doctrine of the ἀρχάνθρωπος in Gnosticism, Manichaeism, and the religion of Persia (*Die Hauptprobleme d. Gnosis*, ch. iv.). Of course, much that is hypothetical enters into all these investiga-

tions, but when he comes to deal with Jewish speculations, he appears to me to make most precarious inferences from the very meagre data which are available. It is quite possible that the dim figure of the "Son of Man" in Jewish Apocalyptic may have its roots in the primitive mythology of the "original man." But there are wide gaps in the history of the doctrine which cannot, as yet, be bridged.

It is evident that we are on hazardous ground if we try to associate Paul's conception of the pre-existent Christ with the chameleon-like figure of the apocalyptic Messiah. For the Apostle Christ is the Jesus who died and rose again. That is to say, the historical figure has inevitably given direction to his thoughts. The living person stands clear before his imagination. Hence for him the exalted Lord has, as Olschewski expresses it, "somehow . . . retained human form in an ideal-glorified fashion" (*Die Wurzeln d. paulin. Christologie*, p. 64). But it was Paul's conviction that in Jesus Christ he was brought face to face with ultimate reality. We know how boldly His cosmic functions are set forth in Colossians. They are deductions from His actual victorious achievement as Redeemer, affected, probably, in this form, by the current attempts to explain the contact of God with the world of men. Yet some of the expressions used allow us to make inferences as to a "Heavenly Man." Christ is described as "image (εἰκών) of the invisible God," and "first-born (πρωτότοκος) of all creation." How far the Apostle's idea is removed from that of a "man" is plain from the central statement of the passage, that "in him all things hold together" (Col. i. 17)

In one passage Paul makes a definite statement of his conception. In Philippians ii. 6 he speaks deliberately of Christ as "being essentially (ὑπάρχων) in the form (μορφῇ) of God." This "form" He voluntarily exchanged for that of "a slave." His new condition is further defined as "the

likeness (ὁμοιώματι) of men." And, as if to lay emphasis on the contrast, Christ is said to "have been found in fashion (σχήματι) as a man." It is impossible to evade the force of such terms. Here is an account of the Apostle's precise view of the mode of being of the pre-existent Christ. As has been said, he must have worked back to it from the overpowering effect in his experience of all that Jesus Christ had been and had done, and of all that as the exalted Lord He was still accomplishing. But his description, however reached, is quite incompatible with the idea of a "Heavenly Man."[1] Otherwise, "man" is used in a sense so abnormal as to make it a totally misleading vehicle of thought. We have no criterion by which to determine the boundary-lines of Paul's conception. It would be rash to attempt to formulate the type or degree of individuality which he would ascribe to the pre-existent Christ.

We have endeavoured, in this study, to show: (1) that at no point of St. Paul's religious construction does the notion of a "Second Man" stand in the foreground: (2) that when he does refer to Christ as the "Second Man," he is thinking, not of the pre-existent, but of the post-existent Christ, in the light of His Incarnation: (3) that the Messianic data of the apocalypses are insufficient to justify the hypothesis that Paul found in them the basis for his conception of Christ: (4) that, in the light of his express statements, it is impossible to associate with Paul's idea of the pre-existent Christ the notion of a "Heavenly Man."

H. A. A. Kennedy.

[1] Holtzmann's attempt to evade the plain sense of Phil. ii. 6 (*N.T. Theologie*[2], II. p. 96) is couched in terms which, it is safe to say, the Apostle could not have understood.

STUDIES IN CHRISTIAN ESCHATOLOGY.

I. The Christian Hope.

It will probably be agreed that modern feeling makes it more than usually difficult to preach with effect about what divines have been accustomed to call topics of eschatology—death, immortality and judgment. One proof of difficulty is the marked infrequency with which the thing is done. Sermons on the joys of heaven or future retribution are now tolerably rare. Not a few preachers studiously avoid such themes, and the congregations even of some who speak out, it is likely, would confess to a good deal of spiritual confusion. The progress of the Christian Year will always force a certain number to face the subject at least now and then, and the uneasy sense that they have held off as long as possible, and longer than they ought, may occasionally impart a rather hectic emphasis to belated declarations. Others find in allusions to the future a too tempting opportunity for eloquence; and a few paragraphs, crowded with bright image or lurid menace, are introduced not from any profound or compelling motive but with a view to oratorical impression, and are felt by the best part of the audience to be artificial. The great majority, however, who will not resort to such expedients, are the most painfully conscious that the policy of relegating eschatology to the background or keeping all statements about the Christian prospect as pale and indeterminate as possible will not serve, and that the Christian people have a right to guidance in this field no less than in others where it is easier to expatiate. The fact that eschatology comes into the Creed is significant and arresting, but in their efforts to comply with its brief and solemn indications men have found themselves embarassed by the richness of material set forth in modern Biblical Theologies and have begun to think that even

Scripture texts, merely as texts, are an inadequate criterion of the truth which it is their business to teach. As a result, we may expect that when reaction from the present neglect sets in, as it must, people will look round for a doctrine of the future whose moral and religious value comes directly home to the religious mind—truth born of faith and therefore triumphantly able to evoke it.

Ecclesiastical thought, as distinct from the New Testament, can scarcely be said to have devoted any special care to "the Last Things." As the conviction grew and spread that the visible earthly Church is the Kingdom, and its triumph the Kingdom's consummation, the centre of gravity slowly changed from future to present. Over and over again it was heretics who kept the eschatological interest alive. In their hands conceptions of the future were mainly employed to censure actual Church life, a method which naturally quickened the suspicion with which official theology inclined to treat the subject. To the official mind, it has been said, the other world was the presupposition of Church activities more than their goal, and nothing is more significant of the subordinate place assigned to the next life than the fashion in which, for mediæval theology, the fortunes of the departed were made dependent on the functions of the earthly priesthood, its sacrifice and intercession. Although the Reformation was a period of acute eschatological feeling—for Luther the end of all things is at hand—yet the unbridled enthusiasm of the Anabaptists discouraged a more theological treatment of the topic in later Protestantism. With the awakening of critical thought in the eighteenth century, and the discovery that prophetic portions of the New Testament owe much to the symbolisms of late Jewish apocalyptic, there gradually arose a disposition to consider eschatology as a falsification, whether blameworthy or inevitable, of

the original message of Jesus, or at least a purely temporary husk round the precious kernel. Then a change came. Bengel, the devout and gracious biblicist, had struck the new note earlier, but not till the nineteenth century had well begun was it echoed back on every side. Men awoke to unfulfilled and even unattempted missionary tasks, and were thus forced to reflect more deeply on the historical purposes of the Eternal ; discussions on heredity opened their eyes to the complex character and conditions of personal responsibility ; and these influences made a re-examination of eschatological conclusions at once natural and unavoidable. Professor Orr, indeed, throws out the suggestion that if the doctrine of Eschatology has ever had an epoch, in which its various issues were submitted to thorough and prolonged scrutiny, that epoch is " our own age, with its generally widened outlook on the universe, its larger conceptions of the divine love, its better knowledge of heathenism, its *fin-de-siècle* feeling—all which have combined to press on it with peculiar intensity the questions of the future destiny of the individual and the race."[1] These words refer, however, to the middle third of the nineteenth century, scarcely to the present day. Doctrinal theology has not recently given much attention to problems of the future, and the extraordinary prominence which Eschatology has received in certain quite recent interpretations of New Testament thought has once more tended, as in the eighteenth century, to invest the subject with a strictly historical interest, and to postpone the question of its religious value.

Objections to the inclusion of Eschatology, as a doctrine of sure and certain hope, in the Christian faith, may be raised from more than one point of view. No credible or inspiring doctrine of the future, it may be said, is necessary to faith ; indeed it cannot be necessary, for it is impossible. How can

[1] *Progress of Dogma*, 280.

any man be certain of conditions or events that lie ahead? Providence, sin, forgiveness—these and suchlike topics rightly enter in the full statement of faith; their foothold in experience is secure. Here we can both understand and verify assertions. We can say for certain what impression of God we receive from Christ, as we can that Nature makes the impression of uniformity. But no such realisation of existent fact is felt when we gaze out to the next life. Accordingly, let us confine ourselves to "this grace wherein we stand," this present fellowship with God our Saviour, leaving its eventual outcome to His wise love. *Wenn ich nur dich habe, so frage ich nichts nach Himmel und Erde.*

This position, if not fully Christian, may be taken by a deeply religious mind. Other critics go further. Is it not so, they ask, that the average man has become wholly indifferent to the future? Does he not receive all declarations on that subject with a kind of passive resistance? Now it is undeniable that not merely materialism but even in large part modern idealism is hostile to eschatology as such; "in the thinking of civilised men," writes one observer, in familiar words, "there has been for years a steady ebb from the shores of another life."[1] Waiving the question whether our age is in this respect like or unlike many another, we shall all concede that immortality has often seemed to lose its glory for good men absorbed in science, in social reclamation, in present imperious duties to which religion herself is summoning every earnest mind. Nor is this indifference an atmosphere simply, the more penetrating in virtue of its elusiveness and intangibility; quite frequently the matter is argued out in calm and measured terms. It is held, for example, that a state of unmitigated bliss would be intolerable to an intelligent being for a week, let alone an eternity. Some, like

[1] Principal G. A. Smith, in *Modern Criticism and the Preaching of the Old Testament*, 209.

James Payn, confess they are so tired, they long only for rest ; and the safest rest is in the grave. They assent eagerly to the Hindu proverb : It is better to die than to sleep ; with an almost passionate resignation they repeat the exquisite lines of the Roman poet :

> Soles occidere et redire possunt ;
> Nobis cum semel occidit brevis lux,
> Nox est perpetua una dormienda.

To the rejoinder that the opinion of humanity is against them, and the horror of extinction universal or nearly so, they answer first by questioning the alleged fact, then by arguing that what men fear is not death, but dying. Death, moreover, cannot touch us, for " where we are death is not, and where death is, we are no longer."[1] Again, doctors have testified that in many years' practice they have never known anyone afraid to die ; and could men die so peacefully, it is asked, or could they in rapidly increasing numbers resort to suicide, if belief in a conscious future were still vigorous and beneficent or had anything further to contribute to the moral resources of mankind ?

Let Christian preachers, then, it is said, recognise in all this a characteristic attitude of the nobler spirits in our time. Let them acknowledge frankly that many people, not inferior in excellence or virtue to their Christian neighbours, have bravely chosen to avert their eyes from the dream of another life, confessing with Romanes that the precept to " work while it is day " has gained an intensified force from the terribly intensified meaning of the words that " the night cometh when no man can work," and expending on this account a purer zeal in unselfish toil for a better order upon earth.

What answer can we make ? This first of all, that Christian Hope is essentially but one aspect of Christian faith ; no

[1] Cf. Haering, *Der christliche Glaube*, 547.

more, but certainly nothing less. It is not a consequence of faith, an inference obtained by unimpeachably valid logic; it is not a natural or independent intuition; it is part of faith itself. It is the same mind which says, "Thou, O Lord, art my portion," and "I am continually with Thee: Thou wilt guide me with Thy counsel, and afterward receive me to glory." Our relation to God in Christ, that is to say, has a future as really as a past, a future which is no mere casual or problematic appendix to the present but its living prolongation. Apart from this, the so-called Christianity which remains must terminate in a pessimism not less dark than the belief in Fate, or εἱμαρμένη, which crushed the mind of Greece and Rome, a belief from which the Gospel promised emancipation, and against which were directed some of the most spiritual intuitions of the Mystery-religions. A purely immanent and mundane Christianity may be constructed any day by the manipulation of ideas; what is certain is that it cannot be believed in. It is indeed the living paradox of faith that the more we consciously receive from God now and here, the more passionately we crave its continuance and the more ineradicable becomes the conviction that this longing will not be put to shame. The pain of loss is real only for those who have possessed.[1] Christian Hope is set not upon a mere multiplicity of things—which must some of them be relative

[1] Many years since, I think in one of Flügel's books, I read a quotation from Jean Paul Richter—the reference I could never find—in which this point is made indirectly and by suggestion yet with startling dramatic force. It is a scene in which a man lies upon his deathbed, expecting the end with inexpressible sorrow, not because he is about to meet a God he fears, but because he is going to part finally with a God he loves. "One friendship perfect and divine" had been his fount of happiness, and in a few hours it would vanish utterly and for ever. Richter pictures him bidding farewell to wife, to children and to friends; then looking his last upon old familiar scenes. "And now," are his final words, "now I must bid Thee also farewell, O my Father." If the writer meant to teach by paradox, suggesting to the religious mind a fact it simply cannot think, he has succeeded beyond all expectation.

and uncertain—but upon Him who is Last because He is the First.

We encounter here one of the few vital questions in this province, and I will offer no apology for dealing with it at greater length. Eschatology has suffered in the general mind because the beliefs it treats of are regarded as somehow optional and arbitrary, not merely in detail but as a whole; and there will always no doubt be those who echo the youthful Schleiermacher's famous contention that to surrender immortality may be noblest of all. But when, putting away abstractions, we betake ourselves to history—which is wiser than us all—we discover that however religion ought to be defined, hope and trust are of its very essence. The concluding sentence in so many a story of childhood, "They all lived happily ever afterwards," is in reality a religious postulate. It is a very primitive form of the ultimate value-judgment which attributes to personality a worth beyond time and greater than the whole world. Look where we may, prophetic religions and religions of redemption seem always to have taken this line; they have pointed forward to a blessed consummation of human life, even when they differed widely as to the meaning of blessedness. Eschatology, in short, is not devout poetry, covering up hideous doubts or fears, like moss upon the torn and ragged stone; it represents a vital and inalienable impulse of the religious spirit. For by its very nature, religion takes account of the last and final things. Its business is with ultimate realities, which have projected themselves into our experience in the form of unconditioned values—values which flatly decline to be relativised by the levelling operations of the understanding in science or the scientific research of history. Neither science with its ultimate categories—ions, atoms, cosmic laws—nor history with its highest terms—classic periods, movements of civilisation and the like—can give or even

conceive what is wanted. Complete and lasting satisfaction is vainly sought in the social experience, or in any remodelled social system we can picture. But religion is religion only as it rises into the sphere of finalities, to unite us with the eternal in modes over which change has no power. Elsewhere we have no choice but to accept the relative ; faith alone has, and better still has promise of, the absolute.[1]

Considerations of this sort, however, gain a profounder impressiveness as we see them give concrete shape to the religion of the New Testament. In Dogmatic as now taught Eschatology comes last, constituting, so to speak, the final movement of the symphony ; it is usually the briefest section of the whole and may quite likely stand for something still briefer in the private creed. But in the New Testament it is the atmosphere in which men live and breathe. Scholarship, we all know, has awakened up to this in the last twenty years. Book has followed book, proving in ever finer detail how the convictions, the incentives and the consolations of the first Christian believers were—not purely eschatological but —eschatological through and through. Technical study, I say, has brought this out recently ; but before it was a theological commonplace, the secret was already known to keen and passionate religion. In a letter of the early 'eighties Francis Crossley, the heroic philanthropist of Manchester, writes : " The coming of the Messiah was the refrain of every Jewish prophet's song, and not less the central image in every glowing picture of the future the Apostles of Christ have painted." He adds (and for this principally I quote his words) : " It is the very flesh of the Bible : remove it, and a skeleton is left." " It is the very flesh of the Bible"—certainly an estimate of the New Testament hope as true as it is striking. Thought upon the great realities—the Kingdom, the Person

[1] Cf. Troeltsch's article " Eschatologie" in *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart.*

of Jesus, the Spirit—is tinged with eschatology in every fibre, and at times all but defined in eschatological terms. Hence it is little more than a stimulating exaggeration to say that delineation of the last things was *the* dogma of primitive belief. To be a Christian is "to wait for God's Son from heaven, even Jesus, who delivereth us from the wrath to come" (1 Thess. i. 10).

Reserving then the question how far New Testament eschatology, in framework or minute detail, is or can be ours, we may call the apostolic mind to witness that Christian hope is no otiose addendum to faith ; it is fibre of the living strand. Life in Christ, felt and known within, tends to a goal by its vital movement. Victory over sin, over sorrow and over impotence—such a victory as can never be again forfeited—is part of the Gospel promise, whereas salvation culminating in death is nothing but a phrase. The soul cannot do justice to the glad tidings, or to the fellowship with God inaugurated by forgiveness—cannot respond to the challenge of His redemptive action for us and in us—except as it travels forward, in desire and presentiment, to an irreversible completion. Thus faith is more than the inspiration of hope ; it is its regulator, its law. We have no right to expect what is not contained by spiritual implication in the Father's self-bestowal in Jesus ; that would be to desert faith for uncontrolled and uninspiring reverie : but also we have no right to expect anything less than Jesus' sacrifice and triumph bid us claim. At present, the Christian mind is in danger of anticipating too little rather than too much. Its somewhat insecure hold upon Jesus' thought of God—the greatness of that thought, its transcendence, the place it gives to omnipotence—has narrowed the sweep of expectation. But the great periods of Christian life—the first century *imprimis*, but also the Reformation—have been rich in eschatology. The noblest hymns, particularly those inspired by the Lord's

Supper, are full of it. The soul, when left to itself, is sure of it and can only be suppressed in deference to a theory. Further, as history proves, religious progress is signalised not by the gradual elimination of "the rapture of the forward view," but by its ever-increasing purity and elevation. Hence it is a just and illumining remark that every system of Theology ought once at least to be read backwards, commencing with the last things, since it is in the conclusion we find the truest index of the whole. If a man has really understood what the Divine Fatherhood means, or the forgiveness of sins, or the new nature; if his faith leads him, as faith in the New Testament does, to take utter fulness of life as the Divine gift and to build his view of redemption to the scale of Christ's infinitude—this will all come out convincingly in his exposition of the Church's hope.

Obviously, however, this is not to be confused with the position, often loosely identified with it, that the traditional scheme of eschatology is acceptable as it stands. The fullest exposition is here not the best. Detail, in eschatology, may be the signal for an inrush of sheer negation. The pendulum has a way of swinging sharply from confident omniscience to quavering doubt, and if in one age there has been much wild talk as to the precise date of Christ's return, or the composition of the spiritual body, or the distance from earth at which the living are to meet the Lord in the air, in the next a tendency will prevail to ask whether *anything* can be known. It will not do to examine men as to their soundness regarding the "lake of fire" or the "second resurrection."

In any case, it is mistaken to speak of "the traditional scheme," as if there were only one. Eschatologies have been fairly numerous; most of them approved or tolerated for a time, all moulded by contemporary modes of thought, and all tending more or less to bind up with the Gospel certain ideas which had come to a given age with the force of a

new revelation but which we can now see to have no claim to fix *the* Christian interpretation of the future. Further, in painting things to come, tradition has drawn without historical discrimination on the different books of Scripture. The resurrection has been pictured in colours copied from Ezekiel's Valley of Dry Bones; the judgment scene has owed something to the visions of Amos; the cartoons of St. Paul, St. Peter and the Apocalypse have been blended freely, as though it were not merely probable but known that all three writers thought alike, even in minute detail. Commentators have now and then been dull; and after all portions of the Bible are sealed to him who has no poetry in his soul. We may say briefly of tradition in this province that it has offended in four main ways: by a specious amplitude of information; by insistence on points in which faith has no vital stake; by occasional self-contradictions where one side of the alleged antinomy possesses little or no religious value; and by its uncritical or statutory use of Biblical phraseology. In general, too, there has been a tendency to indulge fancy at the cost of faith. The graphic symbols of the preacher have been petrified in doctrine. In view of this, a work of revision is become necessary whereby to detect the dead matter lodged in tradition, and to replace "categories with which the mind will not work any more" by conceptions which really help us to exhibit the hope actually cherished by believers.

We naturally turn for aid, in the first instance, to the historic method, and the light it casts on the general religious development. Religious men have invariably hoped, even in presence of death; and hope has always clothed itself in a dress of symbolism. Part of a given eschatological conception must be new, since the world moves on; more will be old, perhaps very old indeed, for eschatology according to experts is the region in which custom dies hardest. As it

has been put by Dr. Charles : " Eschatological beliefs are universally the last of all beliefs to be influenced by the loftier conceptions of God."[1] Regarding a concrete scheme, therefore, we must ask two questions: What are the religious truths to which this emblematic dress was given ? and, Why was this dress chosen, and no other ? A permanent nucleus of belief linked the series of changing forms together, and with this the philosophy of religion may deal, or Christian Dogmatic. Also this belief put on a changing garb of figure and symbol, and the pedigree of this symbolism is a theme for history.

We owe a debt which it is not always easy to pay cheerfully to modern investigators who are trying to bring out clearly the ethnic background and antecedents of New Testament ideas of the End. Success in their inquiry means this at least, that the Gospel did not shrink from categories and thought-forms into which the human soul had already poured its hope and passion. Why should it be felt as other than an ennobling thought that Jesus' way was paved for Him by devout minds of previous days ? Time was when the Church ascribed the Psalms, with scarcely an exception, to a single author, so condemning whole centuries to silence ; and the thought that the Psalmists were a great company of singers, and that in religion the good need not be the enemy of the best, came with the delight of a discovery. Similarly, it is uplifting to believe that spiritual movements in Babylonia or Persia may have prepared " earthen vessels " into which the treasure of apostolic conviction might be poured. Each case where this could be demonstrated would mean not one religious thought the less, but one centre of religion the more. If examples are sought, one may be found in certain exterior traditional elements in the New Testa-

[1] *Immortality* (Drew Lecture), 9.

ment picture of the last great Assize, which have been traced with approximate certainty to the thought of the Farther East. Or again, it is common knowledge that Bible eschatology as a whole is set within a definite framework—the conception of two distinct worlds or aeons ; the present age, ὁ αἰὼν οὗτος, or simply ὁ αἰὼν, largely subject to the powers of darkness, and the coming age, αἰὼν μέλλων or ὁ αἰὼν ὁ ἐρχόμενος, which by its victorious advent abolishes all tragedy. It is upon this grand apocalyptic opposition that St. Paul builds up his main view of the last things. Its roots also lie in the far past. Christianity seized upon it to express that dualistic strain which always marks genuinely religious thought when it contemplates a world in which sin—that "atheistic fact," Dr. Carnegie Simpson has just called it—has made a lodgment. But, as Wobbermin says, "the paradoxical fashion in which the idea is presented with its time-determined scheme—the future age is become present, yet has not ceased to be future—shows clearly what aim the idea is subserving, viz., the unconditional supremacy of one world to the other."[1] Time and eternity, related as empirical to real being, are exhibited in pure contrast and without the faintest tendency to represent eternity as only time on a larger scale, in the great Pauline words : "Our light affliction, which is for the moment, worketh for us more and more exceedingly an eternal weight of glory ; while we look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen : for the things which are seen are temporal ; but the things which are not seen are eternal" (2 Cor. iv. 17, 18).

Our present task, however, lies not in problems of historic affiliation, but in the greater question as to the significance of old eschatological figures for the modern mind.

[1] *Zum Streit um die Religionspsychologie*, 20.

Whatever be the issue of scholarly research, what has counted in the Christian religion, then or now, is not the old vocabulary but the new message. All rests upon the redeeming fact of Jesus—His attitude to the Father, to Himself and to man; this unique experience in which He lived and died and rose again. It is on this that New Testament minds dwell, often simply taking the inherited language for granted. In every religious crisis it is the new that holds the future, and it is Jesus' way to make all things new. As Holtzmann has expressed it in a well-known passage, His effect on contemporary thought may be compared to the plunge of a great rock in the waters of a still pool. When the upheaval has passed, the surface is covered with new wave-movements.

Troeltsch, surveying the past, rightly finds that eschatology, which implies a metaphysic, has always run in one of two moulds, between which even yet we are obliged to choose. On the one hand is the pantheistic type; and here all existence is apt to be an immanent self-adjusting unity, and the time-series of events becomes unmeaning; since there is no such thing as progress, the end of the cosmos is now as completely realised as it will ever be. Opposed to this is a type shaped by personal idealism; the fact of personality is believed in as paramount and absolute, and thought moves in a sphere controlled by ideas of freedom, purpose, creative force. God is here Supreme Will—Will that propels the world on into the future by a series of sovereign acts. And union with God is no mere fact of nature, as it is for pantheism in its varied forms; it is self-surrender to an infinite object. There is a real development and a real end, and the end comes out of the development by way of history. The two views, indeed, are as unlike as æsthetic mysticism and ethical faith in God the Father. Both offer redemption, but in the first case, as Troeltsch puts it, in a not altogether satisfactory set of contrasts, "it is redemption from the par-

tial to the whole, from the mutable to the abiding, from the unreal to the real ; in the second it is redemption from bondage to liberty, from imperfection to the perfect, from rudiments to completion, from conflict to triumph." As has been said, we must choose between them ; and it is worth observing that what really occurs is a *choice*, a moral act motived by ethical and religious conviction, not the syllogistic result of acknowledged premises. Nothing can dispense a man from this ordeal. We have to give either view, in Browning's phrase, our " vote to be true." Not that it is difficult to make points against Pantheism even intellectually. Its famed solution for the haunting problem of the One and the Many is after all no solution, but only the movement of a wet sponge over facts that refuse to be absorbed. Further, it concedes no value to the master-principle of love, in which, rather than in our intellect, our whole experience is gathered up and brought to clarity. But finally the choice of pantheism or personality lies with us, and is an act of intense ethical decision. Sooner or later we have to say in which alternative we find the more prevailing religious power and the deeper ethical satisfaction. Apart from a well-known type of mysticism, which accounts it gross that religion should rest on historical mediation and protests in the name of spirituality that everything must be embraced within the present unity of " God and the soul, the soul and its God," it has never been questionable on which side the Christian eschatology belongs. Hope, for the men who have made Christian history, is not an unconscious acknowledgment that their hold on God is weak, imperfect, and relative ; it is a sure and blessed element in a faith which clasps Omnipotent Love, and is persuaded by the Spirit's inward witness that the confusion and immaturity of earthly experience, terminating in death, is not the end. This, and this alone, is its real character, for God our

Saviour is no ineffable Absolute, the undistinguishing and indistinguishable Whole, in which finally all souls are lost, but the God and Father of Jesus Christ our Lord.

H. R. Mackintosh.

DISCIPLINE IN PRAYER.

The criticism is often passed upon religious experience that it is "mere emotion." This is to limit religious experience very much to the scope of feeling, and to exclude from it a very great deal that properly belongs to it—viz., thought and life, and the quiet examination of life—a great many unobtrusive elements which really form the more serious part of a man's experience of God. But, for the moment, let us limit ourselves to the matter of emotion. It is not clear why emotion should be ruled out. That, like other factors in life, it should be subjected to the tests of time and thought is obvious; but in itself it is at all events just as much right as it is wrong. It has a function, and that we have to recognise. We find very often that the religious life appears to begin with an immense flood-tide of emotion, that the emotion ebbs, and with its ebb the spirit is left as it were stranded, and the religious life ceases, or appears to cease. In this, at all events, the religious life stands very much on a level with all the higher modes of life.

For example, if we take the story of some great picture or great poem, what do we find? First of all, there has been a steady but unconscious assimilation of a very large number of facts; this thing, that, and the other impress themselves somehow on the mind of the artist, but he has not greatly cared about them. Then something happens, whatever it is; a great light shines upon this mass of facts,

of disjoined half-experiences, and they shape themselves into a thrilling unity, which is realised with an intense emotion—an emotion which in large part is an impulse to go deeper into the thing and to express both what has been felt and what is yet to be discovered in an interpretative way. The poet, we say, has his poem already. But he really has not. There is, as he knows well enough, an enormous interval between this experience and the poem. He sees and knows what he means to express; but, quite apart from the technical labour involved in the handling of words or paints, there is an immense deal to be done. He has to consort with the impulse and see where it will take him —to consort with it to the end. And, as he labours with the medium in which he has to work, he finds that the matter changes and changes again. New lights gleam, new relations and new combinations appear, suggesting new values; the impulse becomes another thing, and takes him further and further; until, when at last the poem is written or the picture painted, it is often quite different from that first conception which thrilled the artist and set him to work—"like, but oh, how different!" Without the initial emotion, it is hard to imagine that anything would or could have been done; with nothing but the emotion, it is certain that nothing would have been done at all.

Knowledge, generally speaking, is reached in the same way; it is dependent on intensity. Emotion carries the impulse with all its flame and power into the soul, but then a discipline is involved, carrying with it drudgery and disgust, weariness and dreariness, till achievement crowns all. Otherwise the emotion is fugitive and of little value, —with the added risk that neglected or undeveloped emotions mean a life of sterility, a habit of living on thrills, which effects nothing and leaves the soul less and less

effective. The artistic temperament, unless it is reinforced by what we may call the shop-keeper virtues, is a disaster. The great work of art is as much a sheer moral triumph as it is anything. "The way to perfection," said Pater, "lies through a series of disgusts." "The people of Verona," says Carlyle, "when they saw Dante on the streets, used to say, 'See, there is the man that was in Hell!' Ah, yes, he had been in Hell;—in Hell enough, in long severe sorrow and struggle; as the like of him is pretty sure to have been. Commedias that come-out *divine* are not accomplished otherwise. Thought, true labour of any kind, highest virtue itself, is it not the daughter of Pain?"

Religious emotion is subject to very much the same laws. The impulse has to be carried to the end, worked at, wrestled with, forced in a workaday world, in the monotony of life, to yield what it means. To stand still and let it alone—to wait "to see if it is mere emotion"—has only one end. It is as if the poet or the painter dropped his thought or his emotion and did no more with it. Religious emotion, too, has to be tested and carried further, like any other form of intuition—carried into life. It is tested in two ways at any rate—in obedience and in prayer; and it is of prayer that in this paper some slight account is to be given. For prayer is assailed much as religious emotion is, as essentially unreal—not, however, by those who have done much at it or with it.

Two, or three, main lines of attack are used upon prayer. It is compared to talking through a telephone which is disconnected at the other end; say what you will, as loud as you like, the receiver stands on the shelf, and nobody hears. There are many who have seemed to themselves to be praying on these terms, with a strong and growing feeling that there is no one at the other end, and yet a reluctance to leave off. It is argued further that in a world-order

fixed by Fate or God's wisdom, prayer must be ineffectual or, at best, needless—it is of no use to ask for a change. In each of these lines of reflexion it will be seen that there is a strong element of assumption or pre-conception. What right have you to assume that feeling is an exact guide to fact? Are they anywhere else always and necessarily associated? If we are to depend on feeling as our guide in life, we are the prey of moods. Feeling does tell us something, only its utterance is indistinct—the same feeling may indicate that the dinner is ill-cooked or the train late or the cheque-book mislaid or God non-existent or a hundred other things; and we really need better evidence. As for the second line of attack, it assumes that we know what we have no means whatever of knowing; it turns a conjecture into a fact, and that always means bad thinking. We really know nothing as to what is fixed for the next ten minutes; we do not know what factors are at work, and we tacitly assume that our own spirits are not among these factors—the whole line of argument is vicious from the start.

Both these conceptions of prayer imply one view only of it. It is conceived as petition; but prayer (if those who use it much may be trusted) includes a good many other things and is not so simple as that. Of course it is as simple as that, in one sense of the words—"Ask and ye shall receive" is plain enough, but there are different ways of asking. We may consider one or two other suggestions. Emerson somewhere described prayer as "looking at things from the highest point of view," and another has called it "laying things out before the Ultimate." Dr. Illingworth names it "a unique school of sincerity." All these accounts of it point one way—to what the philosopher called "the clarification of thought in prayer." This and that is on our minds, this and that we desire or fear;

and we lay out our thoughts, clearly and slowly, before our own eyes, with the co-operation of God, at least in His presence, against the background of His thoughts—and then we begin to be able to see what our thoughts and wishes mean. Thus, when we find the prophet Jeremiah saying: "Righteous art Thou, O Lord, when I plead with Thee: yet would I reason the cause with Thee: wherefore doth the way of the wicked prosper?" we shall not be far astray if we count this reasoning with God as prayer. We shall give the same account of the Psalmist, when he says: "I will hear what God the Lord will speak" (lxxxv. 8); and a closer study of that psalm will suggest what follows when the petitional is changed for the listening type of prayer.

There is another aspect of prayer which is sometimes overlooked. It is apt to be the instinctive act of love for another. In spite of all that is talked about germs and their communication, in spite of the fact that a baby pays no attention to its mother's kisses or is even worried by them, mothers continue to kiss their babies for no reason at all—except that they just will; and it appears that babies so treated do better by a long way than those scientifically reared on strict principle in Plato's republic or in St. Ives Workhouse. The instinct is sounder than its critics. Now when matters reach a certain stage, the prayer for the child is as instinctive and as inevitable as the kiss. In other words, right or wrong, parental love, whether God exists or does not exist, demands His existence and presses upon Him the care of the child. The parent's instinct knows the eternal value of the child, and is sure that God must be equally concerned with its goodness and happiness. To say that what is highest in us, this instinct for the child's supreme good, this purest and tenderest form of love, is not evidence, is surely to cut off from

us all chance of really knowing anything. And this instinct makes for prayer inevitably.

But supposing—to come to the third difficulty—supposing after all that in prayer man is merely imposing upon himself, suggesting to himself the existence of a power to help him and thence, from the very suggestion, deriving the strength he needs. We may ask whether this can be done at all, and then whether it can be done very generally. But, after all, "supposing" is not evidence; and as to whether prayer is of practical use or not, whatever the explanation of that may be, we may surely look to the generations of those who have prayed, and we shall find that, generally speaking, those who have prayed with most seriousness have been the best men and they have most believed in prayer. A formal use of prayer, on the other hand, does as little for character as any other affectation or external habit.

But after all, when we are dealing with the religious life, as with any other type, it is the highest that counts, and here we touch the life of our Lord. Historically, it is certain that He prayed and believed in prayer. The Gospels, and the Epistle to the Hebrews, lay emphasis on His practice. Early in the morning He withdrew to the desert; late at night He remained on the hillside for prayer. Wearied by the crowds that thronged Him, He kept apart and continued in prayer. He prays before He chooses the disciples; He gives thanks to God on their return from their missionary journey. Prayer is associated with the Mount of Transfiguration, with the confession of Caesarea Philippi, with Gethsemane. The writer to the Hebrews speaks of His "strong crying and tears" in prayer. The Gospels even mention what we should call His unanswered prayers. The prayer before the calling of the Twelve does not exclude Judas; and the cup does not pass in spite

of the prayer in Gethsemane. It is as if we had something to learn from the unanswered prayers of our Master. Certainly the content of the Gospel for us would have been poorer if they had been answered in our sense of the word; and this fact, taken with His own teaching on prayer and His own submission to the Father's will, may help us over some of our difficulties.

"As He was praying, they ask Him, Teach us to pray as John also taught his disciples." It looks as if at times His disciples caught Him at prayer, or even overheard Him, and felt that here was a prayer that took them out beyond all they had ever known of prayer. There were among them men whom John had taught to pray; was it they who asked Jesus to teach them over again? There may have been some of them who had learnt the Pharisee's way in prayer, and some who stuck to the simpler way they had been taught in childhood. In each case the old ways were outgrown.

We can put together what He taught them. In the first place, the thing must be real and individual—the first requirement always with Jesus. The public prayer of ostentation is out of the reckoning; it is nothing. The real prayer is to the Father in secret—His affair. And it will be earnest beyond what most of us think. We are so familiar with Gospel and parable that we do not take in the strenuousness of Jesus' way in prayer. The importunate widow and the friend at midnight are His types of insistent and incessant earnestness. Do you, He asks, pray with anything like their determination to be heard? The knock at the door and the pleading voice continue till the request is granted,—in each case by a reluctant giver. But God is not reluctant, He says, though God too will choose His own time to answer. It does not mean the corncrake reiteration of the heathen (*βατταλογεῖν*,

Matt. vi. 7)—not at all, that is not the business of praying; but the steady earnest concentration on the purpose, with the deeper and deeper clarification of the thought as we press home into God's presence till we get there. It was so He prayed, we may be sure. It is not idly that prayer has been called "the greatest task of the Christian man"; it will not be an easy thing, but a strenuous.

One part of the difficulty of prayer is recognised by Jesus over and over again. Men do not really *quite* believe that they will be answered—they are "of little faith." But He tells them with emphasis, in one form of words and another, driving it home into them, that "all things are possible with God"—"have faith in God." One can imagine how He fixes them with the familiar steady gaze, pauses, and, with the full weight of His personality in His words, and meaning them to give to His words the full value He intended, says: "Have faith in God." To see Him and to hear Him must have given that faith of itself. The reiteration, "Ask and ye shall receive, seek and ye shall find, knock and it shall be opened to you," even without the explanatory clause, makes evident to any one who attaches meaning to words Jesus' own conviction as to prayer. If the friend in the house to your knowledge has the loaves, you will knock till you get them; and has not God the gifts for you that you need? Is He short of the power to help?

It all comes back to Jesus' conception of God. Here, as elsewhere, we sacrifice far more than we dream by our lazy way of using His words without making the effort to give them His connotation. Will a father give his son a serpent instead of the fish for which he asks, a stone for bread? It is unthinkable; God—will God do less? It all goes back to the relation of father and child, to the love of God; only into the thought Jesus puts a significance

which we have not character or love enough to grasp. "Your heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of all these things," He says about the matters that weigh heaviest with us. Even if we suppose Luke's reference to the Father giving the Holy Spirit to those who ask, to owe something to the editor's hand—it was an editor with some Christian experience—it is clear that Jesus steadily implies that the heavenly Father has better things than food and clothing for His children. How much of a human father is available for his children? Is his giving limited to bread and fish and egg? Then will not the heavenly Father, Jesus suggests, give on a larger scale, and give Himself, in short—be available for the least significant of His own children in all His fulness and all His Fatherhood? And here we have to pause till we realise better what that Fatherhood implies and carries with it. Meanwhile, "fear not, little flock; it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom." "The recurrence of the sweet and deep name Father unveils the secret of His being. His heart is at rest in God." [1] Rest in God is the very note of all His being, of all His teaching,—the keynote of all prayer, in His thought. "Our Father who art in heaven" our prayers are to begin—and perhaps they are not to go on till we realise what we are saying in that great form of speech. It is certain that as these words grow for us into the full stature of their meaning for Jesus, we understand in a more intimate way what the whole Gospel is in reality.

The writer to the Hebrews has here an interesting suggestion for us. Using the symbolism of the Hebrew religion and its tabernacle, he compares Jesus to the High Priest, but Jesus, he says, does not enter into the holiest alone. "Having therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, by a new and living way

[1] H. R. Mackintosh, *The Person of Christ*, p. 399.

which He hath consecrated for us . . . let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith." In the previous chapter he discards the symbol and "speaks things,"—"Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true; but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us." There he touches what has been the faith of the church throughout —that in Christ we reach the presence of God. Without saying so much in so many words, Jesus implies this in all His attitude to prayer. God is there, and God loves you, and loves to have you speak with Him. No one has ever believed this very much outside the radius of Christ's person and influence. It is, when we give the words full weight, an essentially Christian faith, and depends on our relation to Jesus Christ.

Jesus was quite explicit with His friends, in telling them they did not know what to ask, but He showed them Himself what they should ask. "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and His righteousness," He says, and He tells us to pray for the forgiveness of our sins and for deliverance from evil. Pray, too, "Thy kingdom come." "Pray ye the Lord of the harvest that He will send forth labourers into His harvest." In a crowning example, He tells Peter: "I prayed for *thee*." Identification with God's purposes —identification with the individual needs of those we love and those we ought to love—identification with the world's sin and misery—these seem to be His canons of prayer for us, as for Himself. For both in what He teaches others and in what He does Himself, He makes it a definite prerequisite of all prayer, that we say: "Thy will be done." Prayer is essentially dedication, deeper and fuller as we use it more and come more into the presence of God. Obedience goes with it; "we must cease to pray or cease to disobey," one or the other; and the choice, Jesus feels,

grows easier as we realize Him with whom we have to do.

"Ask and ye shall receive," He says; and if we have not obedience, or love, or faith, or any of the great things that make prayer possible, He suggests that we can ask for them and have them. The Gospel gives us an illustration in the man who prayed: "Lord, I believe: help Thou mine unbelief." But it is plain we have to understand that we are asking for great things, and it is to them rather than to the obvious little things that Jesus directs our thoughts. Not away from the little things, for if God is a real Father, He will wish to have His children talk them over with Him—"little things please little minds," yes, and great minds when the little minds are dear to them—but not little things all the time. There is variant to the saying about seeking first the kingdom of heaven, which Clement of Alexandria preserves. Perhaps it is a mere slip, but God, it has been said, can use misquotations; and with Clement's quotation, or misquotation, we may stop for the present. It certainly represents the thought of Jesus, and it may give us a hint for our own practice. "Ask, saith He, the great things, and the little ones will be added unto you."

T. R. Glover.

THE EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS: A NEW TRANSLATION.

I. [1] PAUL, an Apostle not from men nor by human agency, but by the agency of Jesus Christ and God the Father who raised him from the dead, [2] and all the brethren who are with me, to the churches of Galatia,

[3] Grace to you and peace from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ, [4] who gave himself on account of our sins that he might deliver us out of this present evil world according to the will of God who is our Father, [5] to whom be glory for ever and ever. Amen.

[6] I marvel that you are departing so quickly from him who called you in Christ's grace, to another Gospel,[7] which —there is no other,* it is only that certain persons are trying to unsettle you and are minded to pervert the Gospel of Christ. [8] But even though we or an angel from heaven should preach another Gospel to you than that which we preached to you—a curse on it! [9] As we have said before, so now at this time we say again, If there is any one who is preaching a Gospel to you that is different from that which you received—a curse on it!

[10] There! Is it *men* I am now *trying to make favour with*, or God, or am I seeking to *please men?* If I were still trying to please men I should not be Christ's servant. † [11] For I would have you know, brethren, that the Gospel preached by me is not a human affair; [12] for neither did I receive it at the hands of a man, nor was I taught it; on the contrary, I received it through a revelation of Jesus Christ. [13] You have no doubt heard of my manner of life at an earlier time in Judaism, that to an extraordinary degree I

* Or, which is not another.
† Or, bondman.

persecuted the Church of God and devastated it. [14] And I went further in Judaism than many of my contemporaries in my own race, and was distinguished among them by my zeal for the traditions of my fathers. [15] But when He was pleased, who set me apart from my mother's womb and called me by his grace, [16] to reveal his Son in me that I might preach him among the Gentiles, then at once did I not betake myself to flesh and blood, [17] nor did I go up to Jerusalem to those who were apostles before me, but I went away to Arabia, and I came back to Damascus again. [18] Then after three years I went up to Jerusalem to make the acquaintance of Cephas, * and I stayed fifteen days with him; [19] but I did not see any other of the apostles except James the Lord's brother. [20] But what I am writing to you, see, before God, I am telling no untruth. [21] Then I came to the regions of Syria and Cilicia. [22] But I was unknown personally to the Christian churches of Judæa; [23] they only heard that "our former persecutor is now preaching the faith he formerly devastated." [24] And they praised God on account of me.

II. [1] Then, after the lapse of fourteen years, I went up again to Jerusalem with Barnabas, and took Titus also with me. [2] But I went up in accordance with (a) revelation, and I laid before the men there the Gospel which I preach among the Gentiles, but in private to the men of repute; surely (they were to tell me) I was not running, had not run, in vain. [3] But not even in the case of Titus my companion, who was a heathen, was any attempt made to insist on circumcision. [4] This was on account of the imported false brethren, those persons who smuggled themselves in to spy out our freedom which we have in Christ Jesus † that they might bring us into bondage;—[5] to whom

* Some MSS. read "Peter." † Cf. v. 1

not even for an hour did we give way in (the) subjection (they demanded) that the truth of the Gospel might still remain with you.

[6] But from those in repute to be something—what they were at a former time makes no difference to me—God accepts not man's person, for on me those persons of repute imposed no additional requirement, [7] but on the contrary, seeing that I am entrusted with the Gospel of the uncircumcision, as Peter with that of the circumcision, [8] for he who made Peter effective for the apostleship of the circumcision made me also effective for the Gentiles; [9] and recognising the grace which had been given to me, James and Cephas and John, those men reputed to be pillars, they gave me and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship that we should be for the Gentiles and they for the circumcision, [10] only we were to remember the poor—the very thing which I was anxious to do.

[11] But when Cephas * came to Antioch I opposed him to the face, because he stood condemned.

[12] For before the arrival of certain persons from James, he ate together with the Gentiles; but when they came, he took to drawing back and keeping himself apart, being afraid of the circumcision-people; [13] and the other Jews also joined in his hypocrisy, so that even Barnabas was led away to join in their hypocritical conduct. [14] But when I saw that they do not walk straight as the truth of the Gospel requires, I said to Cephas * before all: If you, who are a Jew, (can) live in the Gentile manner and not in the Jewish, how can you try to make the Gentiles live as the Jews do? [15] We are Jews by birth, not sinners of the Gentiles; [16] but knowing that a man is not justified from works of the law, that he is only justified by faith of Christ Jesus, we too believed in Christ Jesus, that we might be justified by faith of Christ and not by works of the law;

* Peter.

for by works of the law *shall no flesh be justified.* * 17 But if, in seeking to be justified in Christ, we were found to be ourselves sinners, O! then is Christ a minister of sin? Never let it be said! 18 For if I build up again that which I destroyed, then it is myself who make myself a transgressor. 19 For I for my part died to the law—the law itself brought this about—that I might live to God. 20 I am crucified along with Christ; it is no longer I who live but Christ lives in me; and the life I now live in the flesh, I live it in faith in the Son of God who loved me † and gave himself up for me. 21 I do not, as they say, reduce to nothing the grace of God (it is they who do so); for if righteousness came through the law, then was Christ's death superfluous.

III. 1 You foolish Galatians, who has bewitched you, ‡ before whose eyes Jesus Christ was placarded as one crucified? 2 This only do I wish to learn from you, was it from works of the law that you received the spirit or from the hearing of faith? 3 Are you so foolish? You began in the spirit, are you now to finish in the flesh? 4 Have you gone through such great experiences in vain, if it really be in vain? 5 And he who supplied the spirit to you, and wrought works of power among you, did he do it on the basis of works of the law, or on the basis of the hearing of faith? 6 As

"Abraham believed God, and it was reckoned to him for righteousness." §

7 You see then that those who are of faith, they are the children of Abraham. 8 But scripture, foreseeing (what is now taking place) that God is justifying the Gentiles on

* Psa. cxliii. 2.

† Some MSS. read "faith in God and Christ who loved me."

‡ Some MSS. add: "that you should not obey the truth."

§ Gen. xii. 6.

account of faith, proclaimed beforehand to Abraham that—

" In thee shall all the Gentiles be blessed." *

9 So that those who take up the basis of faith are being blessed with faithful Abraham. 10 For all who take up the basis of works of the law are under a curse ; for it is written:

(Deut. xxvii. 26.) " Cursed is every one who does not adhere to all the things that are written in the book of the law, to do them."

11 But that in the law no one is justified before God, is plain, for

(Hab. ii. 4.) " The just shall live by faith."

12 But the law does not belong to faith ; on the contrary

(Lev. xviii. 5.) " He who *doeth* them shall live by them."

13 Christ has bought us (the believing Jews) free from the curse of the law, by becoming a curse for us ; for it is written,

(Deut. xxi. 23.) " Cursed is every one who hangs on a tree,"

14 that the blessing of Abraham might come to the Gentiles in Christ Jesus, that we (all Christians) might receive the promise † of the spirit through faith.

15 Brethren, I use an ordinary figure of speech. A testament, though but a man's, once validly executed, no one can set aside or add to it new clauses. 16 But to Abraham (Gen. xii. 7, xiii. 15) were the promises spoken, " and to his seed." It does not say, " and to his seeds," as referring to a plurality, but as referring to an individual, " and to thy seed " ; and that is Christ. 17 What I mean is this : the testament validly executed at a former time by God,‡ the law, which came into existence four hundred and thirty years after, cannot make void, so as to disqualify the promise. 18 For if the inheritance came on the basis of the

* Gen. xii. 3, xviii. 18.

† Some MSS. " blessing." ‡ Many MSS. add "for Christ."

law, then it is no longer on the basis of the promise; but to Abraham God granted his favour through promise. 19 What then of the law? It was added * on account of transgressions, until the seed should come to whom the promise was made, and it was appointed through angels, by the hand of a mediator. 20 (But a mediator does not represent a single person, but God is a single person.) 21 Is the law then against the promises of God? Never let it be said! For if a law had been given which could have given life, then righteousness would actually come from the law. 22 But Scripture has shut up all under sin, in order that the promise on the basis of faith in Jesus Christ might be given to those who believe.

23 But before faith came, we were kept in ward under the law, shut up for the faith that was to be revealed. 24 So that the law was our boy-ward for Christ, that we might be justified on the basis of faith; 25 but now that faith has come we are no longer under a boy-ward. 26 For you are all sons of God through faith in Christ Jesus; 27 for as many of you as were baptized into Christ have put on Christ. 28 There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female. For you are all one in Christ Jesus. 29 And if you belong to Christ, then you are Abraham's seed, heirs according to the promise.

IV. 1 What I mean is, that as long as the heir is a minor, he differs in no respect from a slave, though he be master of all, 2 but is under trustees and stewards till the time fixed by the father. 3 So also we, when we were minors, were enslaved under the ruling spirits of the world; 4 but when the fulness of the time came, God sent forth his son, born of a woman, born under the law, 5 to buy off † those

* Some MSS. and versions "instituted."
† 1 Cor. vi. 20, vii. 23.

who were under the law, that we might receive the adoption. [6] But because you are sons, God sent forth the spirit of his son into your hearts, saying, Abba, Father! [7] So that thou art no longer a slave but a son, and if a son, then also an heir, through God.*

[8] But at that time you did not know God and served as slaves, beings who were not by nature gods; [9] but now that you have come to know God, or rather have come to be known by God, how can you turn again to those weak and poor spirits, and think of being slaves to them once more? [10] You are observing days and months and times and years. [11] I am afraid of you, lest I have bestowed labour on you in vain. [12] Be as I am, for I too was as you, brethren, I entreat you. You never did me wrong; [13] but you know that it was on account of bodily infirmity that I preached to you the former time; [14] but though my bodily state was a trial to you, yet you did not scorn me nor abhor me,† but as an angel of God did you receive me, as Christ Jesus.

[15] Where, then, is‡ that expression of your happiness? For I am your witness that you would, if possible, have plucked out your own eyes and given them to me. [16] And so I have become your enemy by speaking the truth to you! [17] These people court you, but not in a good way; on the contrary, they wish to keep you outside that you may court them. [18] But it is good to be courted in a good matter at all times, and not only when I am present with you, [19] my children, of whom I am again in travail till Christ be formed in you. [20] Yes, I would wish to be present with you now and to change my tone, for I am at a loss about you.

[21] Tell me, you who wish to be under the law, do you not hear the law? [22] For it is written that Abraham had two

* Some MSS. "of God through Christ."
† Lit. "spit me out."
‡ Some MSS. "What then, was."

sons, one by the slave-girl and one from the free-woman.
23 But the son of the slave-girl is born after the flesh (in the
ordinary way) but the son of the free-woman through the
promise. 24 These things are spoken allegorically; for
these women are two covenants, one from Mount Sinai bear-
ing children for slavery—this is Hagar. 25 For Sinai is a
mountain * in Arabia, and corresponds to the Jerusalem
of the present day, for she is in slavery with her children.
26 But the Jerusalem above is free, which is our mother; †
27 for it is written:

(Isa. liv. 1.) Rejoice, thou barren who bearest not,
Break out and exult, thou that hast no
pangs;
For many more are the children of the woman
who is desolate than of her who has the
husband.

28 But you,‡ brethren, are children of promise like Isaac.
29 But as then he who was born after the flesh persecuted
him who was born after the spirit, so is it now. 30 But
what says Scripture?

(Gen. xxi. 10.) Cast out the slave-girl and her son; for the
son of the slave-girl shall not inherit
with the son of the free-woman.

31 Wherefore, brethren, we are not children of the slave-
girl but of the free woman.

V. 1 For freedom did Christ set us free; stand fast,
therefore, and be not harnessed again in a yoke of slavery.§
2 See, I Paul say to you, that if you be circumcised, Christ
will be of no advantage to you. 3 Yes, I protest again to
every man who submits to circumcision that he takes the

* Many ancient authorities, "But the word Agar is Mount Sinai."
† Another reading, "the mother of us all." ‡ We.
§ Many ancient authorities read: "Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ . . ."

obligation on him to do the whole law. [4] Your relation with Christ is at an end, you who seek justification in the law; you are fallen away from grace. [5] For we, for our part, in the spirit and on the ground of faith, await with longing the hope of righteousness. [6] For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision avails anything nor uncircumcision, but faith acting through love. [7] You were running bravely; who hindered you from obeying the truth? [8] The persuasion was not from Him who called you. [9] A little leaven leavens the whole lump. [10] I have confidence with regard to you in the Lord, that you will show no other disposition, but he who is unsettling you will hear his sentence, whoever he be. [11] And I, brethren, if I am still preaching circumcision, why am I still persecuted? In that case the offence of the cross has come to an end, surely! [12] Would that they would undertake castration, those people who are upsetting you!

[13] For you, brethren, were called for freedom; only that freedom—not for an occasion for the flesh, but by love be servants to one another. [14] For the whole law is fulfilled in one word, that namely (Lev. xix. 18) *Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself*. [15] But if you are biting and devouring one another, take heed that you be not consumed by one another. [16] But I say, walk in the spirit, then you never will fulfil the desire of the flesh. [17] For the flesh lusts against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh, for these are opposed to each other, so that you may not do whatever you wish.* [18] But if you are led by the spirit, you are not under the law. [19] Now the works of the flesh are evident; they are † fornication, impurity, lasciviousness, [20] idolatry, sorcery, enmities, strife, jealousy, passions, factions, divisions,

* When a slave received his freedom from a god, he was said to be set free "to do the things that he will."

† Many old authorities add "adultery."

parties, [21] envies, drinking bouts, revels, and things like these; of which I warn you, as I told you before, that they who follow such practices shall not inherit the kingdom of God. [22] But the fruit of the spirit is love, joy, peace, long-suffering, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, [23] meekness, temperance; against such things there is no law. [24] And those who belong to Christ Jesus * have crucified the flesh with its passions and lusts.

[25] If we live in the spirit let us also walk in the spirit. [26] Let us not be vainglorious, let us not challenge one another, envy one another.

VI. [1] Brethren, even if a man be overtaken in any transgression, do you, the spiritual ones, set such a one right in the spirit of meekness, looking to thyself lest thou also be tempted. [2] Bear ye one another's burdens, and so fulfil † the law of Christ. [3] For if a man thinks he is something when he is nothing, he deludes himself. [4] But let each man prove his own work, and then he will have something to boast of with reference to himself alone and not with reference to his neighbour; [5] for every one will bear his own burden.

[6] But let him that is taught the word share with his teacher in all good things. [7] Be not deceived; God is not to be treated with contempt. For what a man sows, that he shall also reap; [8] for he who sows to his own flesh, shall of the flesh reap corruption; but he who sows to the spirit, shall of the spirit reap life eternal. [9] And let us not weary of doing good; for at the proper time we shall reap if we do not lose heart. [10] So, then, as we have still time, let us do good to all, but especially to the members of the household of faith.

* Many authorities omit "Jesus," cf. iii. 29.

† Or, "you will fulfil."

11 Look, with what large letters I write, see you, with my own hand! 12 It is those who wish to make a fine show in outward things, it is they who are pressing you to be circumcised; only that they may not be persecuted on account of the cross of Christ. 13 They do not keep the law themselves, though they are circumcised; they (only) wish you to be circumcised, that they may boast of your flesh. 14 But far be it from me to boast save of the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, through which * the word is crucified to me, and I to the world. 15 For neither is circumcision anything nor uncircumcision, but a new creature. 16 And all who shall walk by this rule, peace upon them and mercy, on the Israel of God!

17 For the future let no man trouble me, for I bear on my body the marks of Jesus.

18 The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with your spirit, brethren. Amen.

Translated by Allan Menzies.

* Or "whom."

NOTES ON THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

I. Introductory.

(1) When the writer was preparing his *Studies in the Inner Life of Jesus* he was constantly confronted by the Problem of the Fourth Gospel. This difficulty hindered and delayed the carrying out of his purpose for a number of years; and at last a solution was adopted only tentatively. The conclusion thus reached has, however, been confirmed by subsequent study and reflexion; and the writer now ventures to submit a fuller statement than was then possible, for he has read enough and thought enough on the subject to entitle him to offer an opinion of his own, however modestly and diffidently; but he has not read so much and thought so little as to be content with merely commenting on the views of others. His method will be not to discuss other theories at all, although when necessary reference will be made to them, but to offer a running commentary on the Gospel, dealing only with such matters as bear directly on the authorship, purpose, mode of composition and characteristics of the Gospel. For it is in this way that he has himself reached the goal of his inquiry. One detail after another has presented itself, almost spontaneously, in such a light as has always made clearer to his own mind the conclusion at first only provisionally accepted in default of a better solution of the problem.

(2) The problem of the Gospel strikes the eye at once, as it were, when comparing Westcott's Commentary and Scott's Exposition of its Purpose and Theology. How can one book appear so different to two competent scholars, and lead them to so diverse conclusions? The weakness of the position of each is that the one fails to give due weight

to the considerations which afford strength to the position of the other. The Fourth Gospel is a Janus-like reality; it is history and doctrine, fact and idea, reminiscence and reflexion. The signs of an eye-witness in the narrative, the familiarity with local and temporary details, the impression of a direct and potent response of human faith to the personal revelation of divine grace in Jesus, the confirmation of the presentation of the Christ in Christian experience support the position of Westcott so far at least as to show that the author was a Jew of Palestine, an eye-witness, and a disciple of Jesus, if these aspects fail to prove that he was the Apostle John. The prologue with its speculative interest, the prevalence in the Gospel in report of speech, as well as record of fact of the peculiarities of thought, tone, temper, also characteristic of the Johannine Epistles, the difference between the manner and method of teaching assigned to Jesus, and the Synoptic representation, lend colour to the contention of Scott that the Gospel is a doctrinal work belonging to a later stage in the development of Christian thought and life, having very slight contact with the facts of the earthly life of Jesus.

(3) A solution of the problem has been sought in various "partition" theories, the separation of a source, more or less trustworthy, from editorial additions, and modifications, dominated more or less by doctrinal interests; but difference has emerged as to the question, whether the discourses or the narratives are more authentic. Wendt, for instance, in his *Inquiry into the Genesis and Historical Value of the Fourth Gospel*, uses as the clue "the difference between the point of view of the Evangelist and that of the discourses of Jesus" in respect to the purpose of the miracles; and comes to the "conclusion that the source contained discourses and conversations of Jesus," and "does not seem to have included any pieces of a purely narrative charac-

ter" (p. 166). From this standpoint he offers a detailed analysis of the *source components* in the Gospel. Against such a hypothesis the final objection seems to be the organic unity of the Gospel as a whole; it is only by rending in pieces a garment that is as a whole without seam that we can in such detail separate source and editorial additions. In the carrying out of the hypothesis we have not, as in the Two-Document theory of the Synoptic Gospels, three distinct works for comparison of the treatment of the sources by the editors: but must set up a criterion of our own, of doubtful validity, as is Wendt's, to determine what does, and what does not belong to the source. The writer was once attracted by such hypotheses, but must now dismiss them as unsatisfactory.

(4) While a detailed analysis seems to him altogether impracticable, yet the Gospel does appear to him to offer indications of three strands so closely woven together that only here and there can we detach the one from the other. (*a*) There are first of all the *reminiscences* of an eye-witness, including sayings as well as doings of Jesus. This eye-witness the writer believes to have been a Jerusalemite, or at least Judæan disciple, who may have been John the elder or not, but certainly was not John the son of Zebedee, one of the twelve apostles. His dominant interest in, and familiar acquaintance with the Judæan ministry on the one hand, and his comparative indifference to, and silence regarding the Galilæan on the other is the main reason for this conclusion, although others will be indicated in the subsequent discussion. (*b*) Secondly, around these reminiscences in the course of years clustered many *reflexions*, resulting not only from this eye-witness's religious experience, but also from his intellectual environment to answer its questions and meet its needs. In his teaching he presented reminiscence and reflexion blended together, so that

his hearers, and probably even he himself could not always tell where the one ended and the other began. (*c*) Thirdly, a scholar of this teacher wrote the *report* of these blended reminiscences and reflexions, discharging the same function as Mark to Peter, and this we have in the Fourth Gospel possibly with later additions. To this scholar is due the interest in the Logos doctrine, and the tribute of gratitude to his teacher in the title "the disciple whom Jesus loved."

(5) This solution of the problem may at first sight appear too complicated; but who can deny that the data to be taken account of, are numerous, varied and even, at least apparently, inharmonious. A solution more simple than the problem may rather be suspect. The solution *all history*, or *all doctrine* is apparently very much more simple, but then neither covers all the facts. The solution this verse is history, and this verse is doctrine may also appear more simple; but what gain is that, if violence has to be done to the organic character of the Gospel? The solution here suggested presents the composition of the Gospel not as a literary labour, but as a living growth; the reminiscences of the eye-witness gathering around them the reflexions of the teacher; and the reflexions and reminiscences of the teacher forming the report of the scholar, in the spontaneity of thought, and the vitality of experience. This is the process of which these notes will seek to collect and present the indications in the Gospel. The reader is asked not to accept or dismiss the hypothesis so barely stated, only as showing the direction of the inquiry, until all the evidence for or against has been presented; as the writer himself desires to deal with the question with the utmost candour, admitting objections to, as well as offering evidence for his view, which he holds subject to all corrections that the further study of the subject may demand, and only until a more satisfactory solution has been found.

I. The Prologue (John i. 1–18).

(1) The prologue has a twofold interest: (*a*) to assert the identity of the Word with Jesus, and (*b*) to deny the superiority of John the Baptist to Jesus. With reference to the second and subordinate interest, a note from Dr. Peake's *A Critical Introduction to the New Testament* may be quoted, as, although the writer read the work referred to on its appearance, he has not now access to it for verification of his remembrance of it. "This has been argued with great originality and acuteness, but also with much violent exegesis, by Baldensperger in his *Der Prolog des vierten Evangeliums*, 1898. His views have met with little acceptance, though the brilliance and suggestiveness of his discussion have been amply recognised. Pfleiderer and E. F. Scott think he has made out his point for the first three chapters of the Gospel. On the other hand, see Jülicher and Loisy, also an article in the *Journal of Biblical Literature*, vol. xx., 1901, part i., by Prof. C. W. Rishell" (p. 224). Without at all discussing Baldensperger's view, we may ask, why should the Gospel throw into the very forefront and interrupt the presentation of the primary and dominant purpose by the denial that John is not to be identified with the Logos, as Jesus is, if there was no party or school which exalted John above Jesus? The report of John's witness to Jesus, and of the abandonment of John for Jesus by the first disciples gains greater significance, if such a contention had to be met.

(2) But we may ask, Was this interest characteristic of the teacher or the scholar, or, as for convenience we may throughout the Gospel distinguish them, the Evangelist (including reminiscences and reflexions) or the Editor? If the evangelist was, as is probable, one of the earliest disciples (verse 37) he would have a personal interest in justifying his preference for Jesus. But, if he was a Judæan

disciple, is it likely that he would himself have so identified John with the Logos, as to be expressing a personal interest, a result of individual experience, in the denial of the identity? Does not the Prologue gain a living power if it is the confession of the experience of the editor? He had been influenced by Philo's teaching; he had for a time sought in what he had learned about the Baptist the realisation of this ideal. What the evangelist had done for him was by the presentation of the life and teaching of Jesus to convince him that the Word had become flesh not in the Baptist but in the Christ. As doubtless in his former view he had not stood alone, so in reporting the evangelist's teaching which had so changed all things for him he was not merely confessing his own personal experience, but was making his personal appeal to his former associates to follow in the path into which he had been led. Apollos, who knew only the baptism of John, came from Alexandria (Acts xviii. 24, 25), and Alexandria was Philo's home. The disciples who had been baptized only "into John's Baptism" (xix. 1–3) were met with in Ephesus. Do not these two facts suggest a possible connexion of the teaching of Philo and the baptism of John in a school or party, which was at a later date still represented in Ephesus? If the editor was won by the teaching of the evangelist from this party the prologue gains in personal interest.

(3) This conclusion would also solve the problem of the relation of the prologue to the rest of the Gospel, regarding which scholars have been divided in opinion. Does the identification of the Word with Jesus dominate the whole of the Gospel? While Scott affirms this, Harnack denies it. (Compare *The Fourth Gospel* of the one, pp. 163–170, and *The History of Dogma* of the other, vol. i., p. 329, note.) A study of the Gospel as a whole and of the Prologue itself has led the writer to agree entirely with Harnack. What

impressed the evangelist in the earthly life of Jesus was "the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth" (verse 14). It is this glory that shines in every page of his record. The interest of the Gospel is not cosmic, but ethical and spiritual; and so Son expresses the meaning he finds in Jesus and not Word. Doubtless, it was the testimony to the Son in the teaching of the evangelist which persuaded the editor that Jesus was the Word; but the interest in the Logos was to begin with the latter's and not the former's. This explanation removes the difficulty of the otiose introduction of the idea of the Logos, which the current view involves.

It also answers another question regarding the source from which the conception was derived. If the editor has contributed this conception we need not ask whether a Palestinian origin can be proved, as we should if the conception was characteristic of the evangelist, a Judæan disciple. As the case of Apollos shows, a teacher from Alexandria might carry the teaching of Philo to Ephesus. We need not assume that the editor had a first-hand knowledge of Philo's teaching, nor that when he was led to identify the Logos with the man Jesus he transferred even the conception he had of the Logos unmodified by the new association. Even at the risk of repetition, for the sake of clearness, the position here maintained may be stated in a few words. The evangelist's presentation of Jesus was dominated by the conception *Son of God*, and this is the characteristic feature of the Gospel as a whole. The editor had accepted the Philonian idea of the Logos as the solution of his intellectual problem, and what the evangelist as teacher did for him as scholar was to lead him one step further, to find in Jesus the Word as well as the Son of God. Just as the more cosmic side of Christ in the *Epistle to the Colossians* was not native to the mind of Paul, but was forced upon him by the incipient

Gnosticism of the heresy he was combating, so this new cosmic idea of the Logos was not congenial to the evangelist, the Judæan disciple of Jesus; but it found its way into the Fourth Gospel on account of the editor, to whom it had been a tutor leading to Christ.

(4) Regarding the presentation throughout the Fourth Gospel of the glory of the only-begotten of the Father, it may at this stage of the discussion be said that it is not such a distortion of history by doctrine that we cannot get back from faith to fact. For (*a*) in the Synoptics Jesus is represented as the Son of God, and in one passage (Matt. xi. 25–27=Luke x. 21) Jesus is reported as making a claim for Himself beyond which the Fourth Gospel does not in the substance of its teaching go. (*b*) As a subsequent study will show, the context of the passages in which a more supernatural endowment seems to be assigned to the person of Jesus than in the Synoptists allows us to correct the representation so as to get back to the facts. (*c*) While the Fourth Gospel does not expressly teach that the becoming flesh of the Word was a *Kenosis* or self-emptying, yet the Sonship is presented as an ethical and spiritual relation, such a dependence on and submission to, as well as knowledge of and fellowship with the Father as excludes the metaphysical attributes of absolute deity from the earthly life. (*d*) A commentary such as Westcott's reads into the Fourth Gospel the theology of a later age, and so finds in it the Christological dogma, which certainly does not do justice to the historical reality of Jesus; but a more historical exegesis yields a very different impression of the teaching of the Gospel. (*e*) The teaching about pre-existence, peculiar to the Gospel, is not necessarily only a deduction from the Logos idea, but may be brought into relation with Jesus' religious consciousness.

(5) It may be more convenient, as the doctrine of pre-

existence is taught in the Prologue, to deal with this conception already at this stage of the discussion. We need not now concern ourselves with the pre-existence of the Logos, as that idea has been already shown to be not decisive for the representation of Jesus throughout the Gospel. But in verse 15 John the Baptist is represented as already testifying to the pre-existence of the man who was to come after him. "After me cometh a man, which is become before me; for He was before me (ὅτι πρῶτός μου ἦν)"; the personal superiority is based on the temporal priority. Was John the Baptist likely to know of the pre-existence of the Christ; and was he the man to express himself in such subtle language? That John bore witness to the superiority of Jesus the Synoptists testify (Mark i. 7), and on this matter the Fourth and the other Gospels are in agreement. But the form in which John's testimony is here given reflects the evangelist's rather than reproduces the Baptist's standpoint. When in iii. 13 it is stated that "no man hath ascended into Heaven but He that descended out of Heaven, even the Son of Man which is in Heaven," it is possible that this is (with the exception of the last clause) an utterance of Jesus of later date; but verse 31 is undoubtedly a reflexion of the evangelist. The allusions to descent from Heaven in the discourse in Capernaum (vi. 33, 38, 50, 58, 62) are entirely improbable in the historical conditions, and in this discourse also we must recognise the development in the evangelist's mind of pregnant sayings of Jesus. The challenge to opponents in viii. 14, "I know whence I am and whither I go," does not explicitly assert pre-existence. But the words in viii. 58, "Verily, verily I say unto you, before Abraham was I am," may well be regarded as an authentic reminiscence. The self-consciousness of Jesus might include a distinct and certain intuition that His relation to God was not, and could not be temporal, but must be eternal

as God Himself. This subject cannot, however, be pursued any further here; but so much must be said to vindicate the trustworthiness of the Gospel at this point. While, for reasons to be afterwards shown, we cannot accept the seventeenth chapter of the Gospel as the *ipsissima verba* of Jesus, for a theological definition as in verse 3 is incredible in His actual prayer, yet the dominant conception of His death as a return to the glory that He had before the world was (xvii. 5) is not improbably a reminiscence of what Jesus did say to a disciple who could understand His deeper thoughts as the twelve, according to the Synoptic testimony itself, could not. This inward certainty need not, and cannot be represented, as by Tholuck in an extreme metaphysical form as "a continuity of the consciousness of the historical Christ with the Logos." If such an idea was present to the evangelist, it belongs to his reflexions, and does not necessarily result as the only possible explanation of his reminiscences.

(6) The statement in i. 17, "the law was given through Moses; grace and truth came by Jesus Christ," may also be taken as an indication of the authorship. It is to be conjoined with the other fact that the opponents of Jesus are throughout the Gospel spoken of as the *Jews*. Both facts indicate a violent reaction on the part of the evangelist against his own nation and its religious life, similar to that of which we possess so much fuller a record in the case of the Apostle Paul. It seems more probable that a Judæan rather than a Galilæan would so disassociate himself from the section of the nation primarily responsible for the rejection of the Messiah. By a Judæan, resident in Jerusalem, and in some way connected with the priestly order, the contrast between the law of Moses and the grace and truth of Jesus Christ would be more vividly realised than by a Galilæan, especially a fisherman like the son of Zebedee,

whose laxer practice made the law less a burden and a bondage. Other indications that the evangelist was a Judæan, and even a Jerusalemite, will be noted at the proper places.

II. The Witness of John (i. 19–34).

This can be dealt with very much more briefly than the Prologue. (1) In verses nineteen to twenty-eight the writer at least does not find anything that need be regarded as in substance unhistorical. If the evangelist was a disciple of John the Baptist, it is probable that he was more fully informed regarding the witness borne to Jesus than was Peter, the probable source through Mark of the Synoptic account. With that account there is general agreement.

(2) In verses twenty-nine to thirty-four two statements emerge which demand explanation: (*a*) The description of Jesus as "the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world" is in so marked contrast to the description of the function of the Messiah in the Synoptists' account of the Baptist's teaching, that it has often been dismissed as unauthentic. In his *Inner Life of Jesus* the writer has tried to show that Jesus thought of His vocation as presented in the picture of the Suffering Servant (Isaiah lii. 13–liii. 12); and has suggested that Jesus had had some conversation with John, and had raised him for a time at least to the height of His own ideal, and that John in this declaration was echoing the words of Jesus. No more satisfactory explanation has since presented itself to his mind. (*b*) In Mark's account of the Baptism (i. 10) the opened heavens and the descending dove are seen, and the voice of approval is heard by Jesus alone. The account of the heavenly utterance in Matthew suggests rather that the voice was heard by, and addressed to others, and not Jesus alone (iii. 17). Luke appears to substitute an event for a vision (iii.

21, 22). In the Fourth Gospel the Baptist claims that he recognised Jesus as the Messiah by the descent of the Spirit (verse 32). Is it intrinsically improbable that the vision was granted to the Baptist to instruct him as well as to Jesus to confirm His sense of His calling ? The statement need not in itself cast doubt on the trustworthiness of the evangelist's record of John's teaching.

Alfred E. Garvie.

SOME REMARKS ON THE TEXT OF APOCALYPSE III. 17.

Students of the text of the Apocalypse are familiar with a case of the "harder reading" in the letter to the Church at Laodicea, where the reading of the Vulgate and of the received text, *οὐδενός χρείαν ἔχω*, which is supported by the strong uncial combination ℵ B P (only note that this B is not the Vatican MS. which usually passes under that sign, but another which takes its place where the great Codex is wanting), is displaced by *οὐδὲν χρείαν ἔχω*, which is found in the uncials A and C, and has some very slight minuscule attestation. Certainly the latter reading, with its queer double accusative, is linguistically the more difficult, and it is not surprising, therefore, that it found its way into the texts of Tregelles, and Westcott and Hort, though Tischendorf adhered to the reading of the Textus Receptus (perhaps the dust from his own discovery had here, as elsewhere, blinded his eyes a little). Now Professor von Soden, in his recently published text of the New Testament, has gone back from *οὐδέν* of W.-H. and Tregelles to *οὐδενός* of Tischendorf and the Textus Receptus. My own inclination is altogether against this change, on a merely superficial study: but it seems that, for the very reason that the matter was assumed somewhat hastily to lie on the surface and not to require a closer analysis, some reason ought to be given for the preference of the "harder reading," beside the attraction of the word "harder." We may, for instance, find out, as the critical world grows older and wiser, that the "harder reading" is often a mere will o' the wisp. I propose, therefore, to examine the reading and the passage in which it occurs somewhat more closely. We will begin with an extract from Dr. Swete's com-

mentary on the Apocalypse; his note on Apoc. iii. 17 is as follows:

In οὐδὲν χρείαν ἔχω οὐδέν is the acc. of reference (cf. Blass, *Gr.* p. 94), or of content (ib. p. 91, where however the note should be cancelled); οὐδενός is an obvious correction, cf. 1 Thess. iv. 12.

Blass' note, to which Swete directs us for its erasure, will be found in the second edition of his *Grammar of the New Testament* at p. 93, and is as follows:

> Schwerlich richtig Ap. iii. 17 οὐδὲν (οὐδενὸς ℵBP) χρείαν ἔχω.

Here then we have the matter stated for us, Dr. Swete explaining that οὐδενός was a natural correction to the awkward οὐδέν, which latter must therefore be retained; while Blass, on the other hand, shakes his head, and prefers the better Greek of the received reading.

Now, in examining this problem carefully, we shall see that there are two directions in which fresh knowledge can be obtained with regard to the meaning of the passage, and so new light can be thrown on the textual problem; one of these directions is historical, and the other is grammatical and linguistic.

First of all, let us recall the historical situation which is the background for the supposed language of the Church of Laodicea: in the year A.D. 60, as we find from Tacitus (*Annals*, iv. 27), there was a terrible earthquake in Laodicea; upon this Tacitus remarks—

"Nullo nobis remedio, propriis opibus revaluit": the independence and wealth of the Laodiceans was such that, making no appeal for aid to the Roman Government, and perhaps even politely declining such aid, they rebuilt their city at the cost of the city itself. This is undoubtedly the situation, which provokes the censure in Apoc. iii. 17. I do not at the present moment recall who was the first to

adduce this illuminating sentence from Tacitus; I have long had it annotated on the margin of my New Testament, and in recent times it has been endorsed by Prof. Ramsay, who summed up the matter in his *Letters to the Seven Churches* in the following sentences :— [1]

"It is characteristic of a city devoted to commercial interests and the material side of life, that the Church of Laodicea is entirely self-satisfied. It says, as the city said in A.D. 60, when it recovered its prosperity after the great earthquake without any of that help which the Imperial government was generally ready to bestow, and which the greatest cities of Asia had always been ready to accept, "*I have grown rich, and have need of nothing.*" It has never seen its real condition: it is *poor and blind and naked.*"

It will be seen that Prof. Ramsay interprets the text (whether οὐδέν or οὐδενός) as meaning that the Laodiceans were in need of nothing: but it is just here that the historical parallel affects the argument: strictly speaking they were not in need of nothing; they were in need at every point where a wrecked city could call for assistance: what they said was that they had need of no one's help, not that they were out of need. This suggests οὐδενός in the personal sense, rather than οὐδέν in the neuter; and this suggestion of personal, outside help is confirmed by the words which follow, "I advise you to buy *of me*, etc." So far then the argument inclines to favour οὐδενός rather than οὐδέν: it is not decisive, because a person who wanted no help from outside might exaggerate his position or emphasise his self-sufficiency by saying that he was not in any need. The balance of the argument is, so far, in favour of von Soden's restoration of the reading of the textus receptus.

But now let us turn to the language itself, and see

[1] l.c. p. 428.

whether any further light can be obtained from that quarter. Let us assume for a moment that οὐδέν is the correct reading. In that case it certainly is not, as Swete and Blass suggested, an accusative of reference: *it is, in fact, the transitional form between the classical negative and the Modern Greek.* One of the things that strikes a student on hearing Modern Greek spoken for the first time is the replacement of οὐ and μὴ by δὲν; δὲν ἔχω (I have not), δὲν εἶνε (there isn't) show the survival of οὐδὲν in a form which cannot be called an accusative of reference. The transition is from οὐκ ἔχω to οὐδὲν ἔχω and then to δὲν ἔχω. That makes δὲν adverbial, whether it comes from οὐδέν or μηδέν.

To illustrate this point, let us take a Modern Greek translation of the New Testament, say such a text as that which was circulated by the British and Foreign Bible Society, a text which is merely the received text slightly modified to popular usage. We shall find that they present Apoc. iii. 17 as follows :—

καὶ δὲν ἔχω χρείαν οὐδενός καὶ δὲν ἐξευρεῖς, κτέ.

Here the οὐδέν of the MSS. has reappeared without the least intention of altering either reading or sense. We may, therefore, say that those texts which read οὐδὲν χρείαν ἔχω merely mean to say οὐ χρείαν ἔχω in a transitional manner, which would in the present day be replaced by δὲν χρείαν ἔχω. This way of looking at the matter may possibly justify us in reading οὐδὲν χρείαν ἔχω as meaning "I am not in need," but not in translating it "I am in need of nothing." If then the harder reading is to be justified, it should be by the recognition of οὐδέν as an adverbial negative. It is not quite clear to me whether this consideration is sufficient to turn the scale, but as there is always a premium on a reading which contains a

lost or unrecognized grammatical form (as for instance the indeclinable πληρής in John i. 14 and elsewhere), we may perhaps give a hesitating verdict in favour of Hort's reading.

Now let us turn from this passage in the Apocalypse to a suggestion made a little higher up, that the Modern Greek δὲν may represent μὴ as well as οὐ. In this case we ought to find the transitional μηδέν.

For example, there is a famous passage in the Gospel of Peter, which is of great importance as showing the hand of the Docetic heretic, who will not accept the doctrine of a suffering Christ. Jesus, in His supposed passion, is silent, *as not suffering*,

ὡς μηδὲν πόνον ἔχων.

Here Dr. Swete, [1] following a suggestion of Mr. J. O. F. Murray, rightly makes the parallel with Apoc. iii. 17. Rightly, for if the one case is popular Greek, so is the other; and we have, in fact, stumbled on the transitional μηδέν which is the conjugate to the οὐδέν of the texts of the Apocalypse.

The result is important in another direction. It was from this passage in *Ev. Petri* that Dr. Chase endeavoured to support his theory of Aramaic origin for the Gospel of Peter. His idea was that μηδέν was translators' Greek for a Syriac word *medem*, which means *anything*. Dr. Chase's words are as follows: [2]

"May not the phrase under consideration be a somewhat literal translation of the following Syriac words,

'As if any-thing (*medem*) of pain was-not to-him'?"

We have shown, however, that the text, as it stands in the MS., may be taken as good colloquial Greek, and does not

[1] Swete, *Gospel of Peter*, p. 6.
[2] *Syro-Latin Text of The Gospels*, p. 50.

require nor suggest Aramaic influence. So much for the Docetic passage in the Gospel of Peter.

No doubt further instances will be forthcoming of the peculiar usage to which we refer.

One other point comes out from the investigation on its historical side: it is this, that the parallel which we have adduced between the language of Tacitus and the message in the Apocalypse derives much of its force from the supposition that the Laodicean letter was written at a time not very remote from the earthquake itself. Forty years later than the earthquake, people would not have their minds full of the fact that the city had been restored at its own expense, nor, at this length of time, would a Christian writer have been likely to spiritualise the incident. The suggestion is that the Letters to the Seven Churches were written not very many years after A.D. 60.

RENDEL HARRIS.

MISCELLANEA EVANGELICA: A REPLY.

When my friend, Dr. J. B. Mayor, while acknowledging a copy of my *Miscellanea Evangelica*, communicated to me his proposal to send to the Expositor a criticism of the chapter entitled "The Disciple that was known unto the High Priest," I replied, expressing my gratification, and adding that if he would explain in it why the Synoptists omitted all mention of any one else, besides Peter, as following Jesus from Gethsemane to the High Priest's palace—whereas the Fourth Gospel mentioned also "another disciple"—I should hail him as a benefactor.

I could not therefore but feel some disappointment on finding in it no attempt at any such explanation. It contains—besides a statement of objections to my view—an attractive exposition of the popular view, namely that the unnamed disciple is the son of Zebedee; and it is illustrated by extracts from various sources bearing on Peter's denial and Judas' remorse. But, while reading through it, I have been unable to keep myself from constantly repeating: "Mark, traditionally recognised as the Petrine Gospel, says '*And Peter* [*had*] *followed Him afar off*.' The parallel Matthew and Luke say the same thing in nearly the same words. Why do they not add, '*And John followed too*'—if John really followed?" To this question Dr. Mayor, as far as I can see, neither supplies, nor attempts, an answer. Yet it is a question that bears on the name of the unnamed disciple, besides being of great importance for its own sake.

It is a matter of minor importance that my view has not always been correctly represented. For example, Dr. Mayor says, "I see no possible reason why he, who is in every Gospel described, over and over again, as the be-

trayer of Jesus into the hands of sinners, should here be represented as one who had done nothing to forfeit the friendship of the other disciples, though he had come straight from the garden of Gethsemane, bringing Jesus bound with him." I certainly did not regard Jesus as " here represented " in this light, and I am at a loss to find what I have written that gave that impression.

Dr. Mayor adds, " Imagine Peter . . . selecting Judas as his companion to the Court where Jesus was to be tried, and accepting his help for admission into that court ! " I had never " imagined " Peter as " selecting." The imagination appears to me as absurd as to Dr. Mayor. And the expression " accept his help " seems to me to make insufficient allowance for Peter's probable state of mind, and for that of Judas also. I endeavoured to show that Judas, in a passion of suspense and remorse, might have almost drawn Peter into the court, " taking him by the hand " —as Nonnus says—and that Peter, through mingled motives, allowed himself to be thus drawn.

Then Dr. Mayor asks, " Is it true that Judas was the familiar friend of Caiaphas and the intimate partaker of his counsels, as Dr. Abbott maintains on p. 30 ? " Here I may have failed to make my meaning clear, taking it for granted that my readers would perceive that there was in this passage an instance of that Johannine irony to which attention has been called so often in previous parts of *Diatessarica*. I did not for a moment intend to maintain that Judas *was*, *truly and literally*, the " familiar friend " of Caiaphas. The notion seems to me, as to Dr. Mayor, ridiculous. I maintained only that Christians, applying the poetry of the Psalms about the treachery of David's " familiar friend " to the treachery of Judas, the Lord's " familiar friend," would describe the latter, in allusive language, as becoming the " familiar friend," not of Jesus

but of Caiaphas.[1] Perhaps I ought to have added, what Dr. Mayor adds, that "The Gospels tell us plainly that he was merely the instrument employed by Caiaphas to carry out the design of the latter for the murder of Jesus." That is the fact. And they tell it so plainly that I thought (perhaps wrongly) that it did not need to be told over again.

Returning to Dr. Mayor's picture of the arrest and its immediate sequel, I cannot help thinking that he deals in assumptions when he says, "We read in Matthew xxvi. 37 f. that those who had taken Jesus (*viz. Judas with his armed band*) *led Him away to the house of Caiaphas*, but Peter followed Him afar off. Judas and Peter therefore were separated from each other by a wide interval." Not one of the four evangelists supports the assertion that I have italicised. They all distinguish—and perhaps deliberately distinguish—the soldiers, who laid hands on Jesus, and arrested Him, and led Him away, from Judas, who is not recorded as doing any of these things.[2]

The truth seems to be that Judas, at the moment of the arrest, might be regarded in two aspects, either (1) as *coming up* (προσερχόμενος) *to Jesus along with the soldiers*, an avowed traitor, or (2) as *coming before* (προερχόμενος) *the soldiers*, at such a distance in front of them as to give colour to the view that he was a fugitive, running before

[1] *Miscell.* p. 30: "His [Judas'] comings and goings during these negotiations might naturally give him an entry to the High Priest's palace, and lay him open to the Christian reproach that he, who should have been the 'familiar friend' of Jesus, had made himself the 'familiar friend' of Caiaphas. That was the way in which Christians might apply the words in the Psalm, 'It was thou . . . *my familiar friend*.' Concerning this utterance Jerome says, 'It was the saying of Christ about *Judas*'; and Origen assumes it."

The same explanation applies to the words (*ib.* p. 23) "another disciple who was the bosom friend of Caiaphas."

[2] See Mark xiv. 45 καὶ ἐλθὼν εὐθὺς προσελθὼν . . . κατεφίλησεν αὐτόν· οἱ δὲ ἐπέβαλαν . . ., and Mark xiv. 53, and the parallels to both passages.

them to warn his Master of their approach.[1] If Judas was playing the latter part, he would probably not accompany the column (as a member of it) to the house of Caiaphas, but might follow in the rear of it, a little before Peter who "followed afar off." Then Judas might go into the palace, while Peter, coming up afterwards, remained outside. There is nothing to necessitate the conclusion that Peter and the unnamed disciple arrived together.[2]

Dr. Mayor, assuming that Peter and John arrived together, says, "It seems probable that the two leaders, Peter and John, would quickly meet and arrange to follow cautiously after Jesus." But what ground is there for assuming that Peter and John were "the two leaders"? And does any one of the four narratives—which all place the "following" immediately after the "leading away"—favour the view that there was time for such "meeting" and "arranging"? And is it "probable" that, if this meeting happened, all the Synoptists would omit not only the meeting and arranging, but even the very name of "John" as "following cautiously after Jesus" with Peter as his companion?

I quote such expressions as "arranging," and "following cautiously," because they seem to impute to Peter a deliberation that could not possibly have existed, the supposition of which makes it difficult to understand his conduct. We must also carefully distinguish what Peter knew about Judas, when he thought over matters on the morrow,

[1] *Προέρχομαι* occurs about twelve times in LXX and about ten in N.T. In LXX there are four instances, and in N.T. six, of a variant *προσέρχομαι*. Mark xiv. 45 and Matt. xxvi. 49 have *προσέρχομαι*, Luke xxii. 47 has *προέρχομαι*.

[2] John xviii. 15, *ἠκολούθει δὲ τῷ Ἰησοῦ Σίμων Πέτρος καὶ ἄλλος μαθητής* might give the impression that Peter arrived first. But it appears to me that Peter is placed first as being first in the writer's thought—the following of the unnamed disciple being added secondarily to explain how Peter obtained admission.

from what he knew about Judas as he followed Jesus to the High Priest's palace. To say that Judas "is in every Gospel described, over and over again, as the betrayer of Jesus into the hands of sinners," is surely not to the point for us, placing ourselves along with Peter at the High Priest's gate. Peter had not then read the Gospels. In theory, no doubt, Peter had been prepared for the treachery of Judas by the "dipping" of the "sop" given to the traitor by Jesus. But that act is described in the Fourth Gospel alone. And that Gospel implies a mystery about it. Jesus did not reveal the secret to Peter, but only to the beloved disciple—who may be presumed, but is not declared, to have passed on the secret to Peter. Even then, says the Fourth Gospel, "no man at the table" knew what Jesus meant when He said to Judas, "What thou doest, do quickly." In the excitement of the arrest and its sequel, when Peter, after striking one blow, was forbidden to strike a second, and saw his Master led away by the soldiers, himself following afar off, divided between bewilderment and despair, is it not readily conceivable that he forgot for the moment that mysterious "giving of the sop" a few hours before?[1] And then, in that dazed condition, while he was standing at the door of the High Priest's court, if Judas suddenly came out and drew him in, to describe Peter as "accepting his help for admission" appears to me an expression too coldly logical. Peter may have been in no mood for balancing "accepting" against "rejecting." He would naturally be thinking, not of Judas, but of Jesus; and, for the moment, the thought of his Master's fate might well banish or subordinate every other thought.

[1] No doubt, if Peter had heard the words in Luke xxii. 48, "Judas, betrayest thou the Son of man with a kiss?" his recollection of the giving of the sop to Judas would have been quickened. But must he be supposed to have heard them? The parallel passages in the other three Gospels contain nothing like this. Matthew contains something entirely different.

No doubt, if Judas "had come straight from the garden of Gethsemane, bringing Jesus bound with him," Peter would have shrunk from him. But the attribution to Judas of the act of "bringing Jesus bound with him" has no more basis in the Fourth Gospel than in the Three. That Gospel mentions in detail "the band" and "the chief captain" and "the officers of the Jews" as "seizing" and "binding" Jesus and as "leading" Him to Annas. The writer might have added, as he did earlier, "And Judas was standing with them." But he has not done so. He has left us free to suppose that Judas, after the arrest, passed into the background, and merely "followed" in the rear of the column that led Jesus to Annas.

And now to pass to the positive and constructive part of Dr. Mayor's comment. It seems to me to be based largely on an explanation of *γνωστός*, "known," as implying "known" *in consequence of a customary commercial connexion*. We may almost say that the High Priest is regarded as one of John's commercial patrons, and John as one of his "customary" tradesmen. At all events, Dr. Mayor renders what Nonnus says about the unnamed disciple thus: "a well-known acquaintance of his customer, the high priest (literally 'the customary high priest') (*ἐθήμονος ἀρχιερῆος*)."

Now in the first place, as to the meaning of Nonnus' word *ἐθήμων*, is there any instance of its meaning "customer," or of its being applied to commercial connexion? I can find none, either in Nonnus or in the Greek *Thesaurus*. Hesychius, among other synonyms of *ἐθήμων* implying similarity of habits, gives the word *συνήθης*. This is a word used by Symmachus to mean "companion" in the passage where the Psalmist speaks of his "*companion* and familiar friend." [1] It means something very different

[1] Ps. lv. 13 LXX, *ἡγεμών μου καὶ γνωστέ μου*, Symm. *συνήθης καὶ γνώριμός μοι.*

indeed from "customer." For the most part it implies a similarity of habits and tastes together with habitual and familiar intercourse.

In the next place, as to the fact, Dr. Mayor says, "I see no difficulty in supposing that John, at any rate before he was called to be an apostle, might have carried about for sale fish caught in the sea of Tiberias." But "before he was called to be an apostle" implies (in the Fourth Gospel) some three years ago. At that time, John, if he lived (as Irenaeus says) into the reign of Trajan, would be (as he is traditionally represented) little more than a youth. Are we to suppose that, by means of this piscatorial connexion, discontinued three years before, this youthful and not very wealthy fishmonger—the younger son of a father owning (as far as we know) but one out of some three hundred and thirty[1] fishing-boats on the Sea of Tiberias —had become "a well-known acquaintance of his customer, the high priest," with such permanent results that the portress of the High Priest's palace, presumably the same portress as in old days, still recognised his right of entry?

This and other difficulties attending the popular view —but most of all, the silence of the Synoptists about John's accompanying Peter into the High Priest's court—appear to me greater than the difficulties (though they, too, are great) attending the hypothesis that the unnamed disciple was Judas, or at all events was regarded by the Fourth Evangelist as Judas. For these reasons I still adhere to the belief that the clue to the Johannine narrative—so far as concerns the expression under consideration—is to be found in the above quoted words of the Psalmist, mourning over the treachery of one whom he calls his "*familiar friend* (γνωστός)." We have seen that Origen and Jerome applied the passage to Judas. Now Jesus would be re-

[1] "Three hundred and thirty" See Josephus, *Wars*, ii. 21, 8.

garded by all Christians as their High Priest. The Epistle to the Hebrews repeatedly applies that title to Him, and also calls Him "the High Priest of our Confession." Judas, who might have been, and had been chosen to be, "a familiar friend," in the true sense, of Jesus the true High Priest, chose for himself to be "a familiar friend," in the false sense, of Caiaphas the false High Priest, by whom the true one was condemned to death. This tragic contrast, imbued with Johannine irony, appears to me to underlie the Johannine tradition that we have been discussing.

There are difficulties in this view, great difficulties. To deal with them adequately would be impossible within the limits of this article. Here I will only say that they do not seem to me at present so great as those presented by the hypothesis that "the Disciple whom Jesus loved" was described by the author of the Fourth Gospel as the γνωστός of Caiaphas in either of the senses above mentioned—either as his "familiar friend," or as his customary supplier of fish.

EDWIN A. ABBOTT.

A STUDY IN I CORINTHIANS XV.[1]

What I have to say is a very imperfect attempt to express what I have learnt to hold. I do not wish to be in the least dogmatic: discussion will help us towards that which we all seek, the truth; and sometimes it is better to put down, however crudely, what one's own thoughts are, than to condense or combine the opinions of those commentators whose works are in the hands of us all.

This doctrinal section, nearly at the close of St. Paul's letter, was not written, so far as appears, in answer to any question propounded in the letter brought to the Apostle by the Corinthian delegates, such as called forth the passages in chapters vii.–xiv. It was evoked most probably by some reports that had reached St. Paul about the doubts that were felt by some of the Corinthian Christians as to a general resurrection—doubts arising apparently from grossly materialistic views as to the nature of the resurrection body.

I. One great value of this section of the letter lies in the glimpse which it gives us of the customary course of teaching which the Apostle pursued in his missionary labours. The atoning death of Christ, followed by His Resurrection on the third day, formed the essential of his preaching, and this keynote of doctrine the Corinthian Christians all held. The belief in Christ's Resurrection was their firm faith and belief. And so the opening phrases, which are so often mistaken to be formal teaching and proofs of Christ's Resurrection, are merely reminders of the Creed which St. Paul had left with his converts—much as in our own preaching, we find it convenient and fitting some-

[1] A Paper read at a meeting of the East Brooke (Norfolk) Branch of the Society of Sacred Study, July, 1913.

times to quote articles from the Roman or Constantinopolitan Creed. He was not in the least concerned to prove to them that Christ had risen : that was unnecessary. His object was to convict these dubious ones of an absurd fallacy in their logic. They believed that Christ had risen, and yet maintained in opposition to this particular affirmative the general negative proposition that "a resurrection of dead men is impossible." They admitted the Resurrection of Christ, but objected to the principle of any resurrection at all. We may note in passing that modern views reverse the Corinthian error. There is little objection now to the principle of resurrection, but the actual resurrection of Jesus is sometimes denied. Both errors are the result of a false spiritualism which by an ironical nemesis developes into an unhappy materialism.

In a series of short terse dilemmas the Apostle points out the ridiculously miserable position into which their logical fallacy led them and left them. It robbed them of their foundation belief and of all the benefits of the salvation that Christ had brought, and it rendered nugatory such practices as "baptism for the dead," and cut at the root of all Christian self-sacrifice. How could they be so short-sighted as to allow the firstfruits but deny the harvest which the firstfruits implied ? They forgot that everything, including death, was to be subdued by Christ ; and that in Him were included His followers, the members of His Body. Let them beware of being led astray, by those who denied a future resurrection, into a maze of corrupt or careless living. Doctrinal error would certainly issue in moral decline, while the greatest incentive to right conduct would be found in right belief.

This brief *résumé* covers, I think, the first 34 verses of the chapter. But a few points in the course of the argument need a little closer notice.

(*a*) Verses 3, 4, 5 have all the appearance of being a quotation from an early form of Creed—at least they shew us a Creed in embryo. He calls the articles "first or foundation principles."

"Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures.

And was buried,

And was raised on the third day, according to the scriptures,

And He appeared to Kephas, and the Twelve. . . ."

But what "scriptures" are referred to in accordance with which Christ died for our sins and rose again the third day? Would that St. Luke had preserved for us the Lord's own exegesis of the Sacred Writings when, "beginning from Moses, and from all the prophets, He interpreted (διερμήνευσεν) to them in all the Scriptures the things concerning Himself," (Luke xxiv. 27). We should have had the deepest of all "hermeneutics" for our enlightenment and guidance. Our Lord is apparently made to include "the third day" in Old Testament prophecy (*ib.* 46); and it is remarkable that so slight a detail should have been noted and have riveted itself into the Creeds. There is the passage in Hosea (vi. 2 "After two days he will revive us; on the third day he will raise us up, and we shall live before him"); and even 2 Kings xx. 5 has been pressed into service, where Hezekiah was assured of his recovery, and that on the third day he should go up unto the house of the Lord. But I believe that the expression "two or three days" was merely a common formula for a very short time; much as the round figure 40, whether used of days or years, denoted a good length of time without preciseness of accurate measurement. And I am not sure that it is not better to restrict the phrase κατὰ τὰς γραφάς to the prediction and fact of the Resurrection only, and not extend it to the exact day of the event. Readers of

Athanasius will remember his three reasons for the particular interval of three days between the death and resurrection :—" Not on the same day, lest the real death should be denied : not on the second day lest His incorruption should not be clearly manifested : and not later than the third day, lest the identity of His Body should be questioned, His disciples be kept too long in suspense, and the events forgotten" (*de incarn. V. Dei*, 26).

(*b*) In verse 22 the phrase " as in the Adam all die, so also in the Christ shall all be made alive " very probably implies that St. Paul believed the Adam in the Creation stories in Genesis to be a historical personage ; but the ambiguous meaning of the Hebrew word, which may be either a proper or a common noun, leaves it open for us to understand " the Adam " as denoting man in his lower physical nature as one of the animal creation upon whom death passes, as distinct from the spiritual side of man's personality which constitutes the higher supernatural aspect of man as a child of God. At any rate we all can feel that " Adam," literal or metaphorical, stands for the twin mystery of sin and death.

(*c*) Of the surrender of the Kingdom at " the end " by the Son to the Father, and of the reconciliation of this passage with the words of the angel Gabriel to Mary which are incorporated in our liturgical creed, and which caused much disquietude to Marcellus, I venture to remark only, that we know too little of the interrelations of the Three-in-One either to understand or to criticise. St. Paul's ideal conception of ὁ θεός being πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν in the one far off divine event meets us more than once in his epistles. The " subordination " of the Son to the Father in their eternal absolute relation finds a place also in the Gospel—" My Father is greater than I " (John xiv. 28).

(*d*) I pass to the *crux interpretum* of " those who are

baptized for the dead" (verse 29). The point of the argument is obvious. The mere fact of Baptism presupposes a Resurrection. If the future resurrection of us all is a mistake then the sacrament is a farce. But if the point of the argument is clear and unequivocal, the exact custom referred to is most obscure. The early Greek Fathers understood it of ordinary Christian Baptism. Others, mostly Western and modern commentators, explain it either of vicarious Christian baptism of living proxies for deceased relatives, or of converts led to baptism out of affection for deceased Christian friends. That the idea of vicarious lustrations for the dead was not alien to Jewish thought is proved by the action of Judas Maccabaeus recorded in 2 Maccabees xii. 38 ff., where a sacrifice or sin-offering was offered on behalf of those who had died when ceremonially unclean, with a view to their resurrection. "For if he were not expecting that they that had fallen would rise again, it were superfluous and idle to pray for the dead." (The whole passage is worth study.)

I do not think that the Apostle would be referring in an argument like this to the ritual of the "mysteries," Mithraic or other; but I confess that I cannot satisfy myself as to which interpretation is best; and I never cease to regret that something so ambiguous is read in the Lesson in our Burial service, striking no note of real consolation or of warning.

II. Let us turn now to the second part of the chapter which deals with the nature of the resurrection body. I imagine that the objectors whom St. Paul answers had been led to their denial of the general resurrection by a curious materialism in their view of the resurrection body. Two points puzzled them. The manner of the resurrection, and the kind of body the raised ones would bear. *How*, are the dead raised, and *with what manner of body* do they

come ? " St. Paul's answer is drawn from simple analogies in nature. The seed that even the objector himself sows perishes as to its outward husk in order to let the germ of life within it clothe itself with a new organism, which retains a principle of identity with, even though it differs externally from, the original seed.

We know how in our own bodies identity is only preserved by constant change. In fact personal identity would be lost without change of the outward body. The πῶς, the " how," is thus answered by every analogy that we see around us. There are diversities of bodies of every kind already existing, in form and rank and quality and beauty and glory, in things terrestrial and things celestial, and yet the immense variety of these differences does not cause difficulty to anyone. They are accepted as quite natural, because each is determined by God in its own order and proper sphere. Then why should there be any difficulty in the conception of a spiritual body fitted for a spiritual sphere ? God will give to the raised ones spiritual organisms adapted to their new environment.

But *what manner* of body ? Certainly not a perishable body of flesh and blood. The psychic body which we wear here will be exchanged for the pneumatic body which we shall wear hereafter. But the psychic body comes first : it is, as it were, the scaffolding by means of which the pneumatic body is built. And as assuredly there is a psychic body, so equally assuredly is there a pneumatic body for each of us. The " Adam," mortal man, is a living psyche : the Christ is a life-creating pneuma, and in Him and by Him alone Christians exist. The one is of the earth ; the other is of heaven. And as we have borne the *eikon* or outward semblance of the earthy, so shall we hereafter bear the *eikon* of the heavenly.

Personality as we know it consists in a union of soul and

body, and if that personality is to continue through death, it must still consist of soul and body; for the body is an essential element of human personality. But the spiritual body will differ from the natural body as much as the butterfly differs from the grub: it will be more glorious— a "body of glory"—because adapted to its environment of glory. The σῶμα in St. Paul's view is the organ of personal consciousness which survives the change or dissolution of the outward fashion or σχῆμα. The σῶμα, for instance, (one might say) of the insect is preserved through the three changes of its σχῆμα or εἰκών as grub, chrysalis, butterfly.

And here I particularly want to point out that the verses 42–44 must not be referred to the dead corpse and its quasi-material revival or resuscitation. That is the very error that St. Paul was combating. He is speaking of the resurrection of those whom we call the dead, ἡ ἀνάστασις τῶν νεκρῶν. And he does *not* say "The *dead body* is sown in corruption and raised in glory." That would be a ridiculous statement, untrue to fact and to experience. He is not thinking of *burial* at all: burial is not within the purview of his argument. The verbs are impersonal. He says σπείρεται, "there is a sowing in corruption, and ἐγείρεται, there is a raising in glory." And the "sowing," is not the burial of the dead body, but the planting of our individual lives here on earth. This is absolutely clear; because the order in St. Paul's mind is sowing, death, resurrection (verse 36); whereas the common view makes the order death, sowing, resurrection. The sowing, as in the case of the seed, must *precede* the death, not follow it. Moreover, could one speak of a dead corpse, πτῶμα, as a σῶμα ψυχικόν? Yet he says we are sown—"there is a sowing of a psychic body and a raising of a pneumatic body." Nor should we speak of a corpse as "weak." The corruption, dishonour, weakness (φθορά, ἀτιμία,

ἀσθενεία) in which our individual lives are sown, represent our subjection to corruption, sufferings and death—"the weakness of our mortal nature"; and answer to the Apostle's phrase in Philippians, τὸ σῶμα τῆς ταπεινώσεως ἡμῶν. This phrasing, coupled with the analogy of the seed, settles once and for all, to my own mind, the interpretation which we must give to the Apostle's words.

A few subsidiary matters remain.

(*a*) In verses 51, 52 (as in 1 Thess. iv. 15) St Paul contemplates himself as amongst those who will be alive at the last day. "We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed." That is to say, when he was writing, he believed the ἐπιφανεία or παρουσία would come in his own lifetime, and in that of the majority of his readers. Hence, to meet any possible objection or question as to what kind of bodies those still living on earth at that solemn crisis would wear when the dead were raised, he asserts that *all* must undergo the same change,—the dissolution of what is mortal, and the assumption of the body of glory. He describes this change from the body of our humiliation to the body of glory in Philippians iii. 21 as a "refashioning" or change of the outer [illegible]; but *how* this transformation is effected he does not tell us, any more than he gives a description of the pneumatic body. It is probably beyond our present comprehension. "The last trumpet" is, of course, an apocalyptic symbol emphasising the fact that the transmutation of dead and living will be a simultaneous response to the same signal.

(*b*) In verse 55 we have an instance of what Paley called "accommodations,"—language borrowed from the Old Testament and used in a sense very different or even opposed to that of the original writer. In Hosea, Yahweh calls aloud for the terrors of Death to work their worst on the impenitent people of the Northern Kingdom. Here St.

Paul derides Death and Sheol as robbed of their power and bitterness.

(*c*) I have one other remark to make. St. Paul does not appeal to the appearances of the Risen Christ as helping his readers to form an idea of the nature of the resurrection body. And the reason, I think, is this. The accounts in the Gospels are so mysteriously difficult to harmonise that it is almost impossible to form any coherent view of the nature of our Lord's Body after His Resurrection. That He "rose again" is certain; but in what kind of a body He chose to appear and disappear, and disguise His form, and eat material food "before" and "with" His disciples, we cannot say. So that the appearances of the Risen Lord are *least* helpful in aiding us to think of our own future spiritual bodies. His Body "saw no corruption": our bodies do see corruption. But suppose, for example, that our Lord, instead of being buried as a Jew, had been cremated as a Roman or a Greek,—and very many of the bodies of martyrs of all ages have been burned before or after death without the smallest hesitation as to their future resurrection being felt—there could have arisen no disputes about the empty tomb or the nature of His Resurrection Body. Yet His Resurrection, His victory over death, His continued Life in exaltation, would have been equally assured, at any rate to St. Paul, by the revelation that came to him on the Damascene road, and which turned the superbly orthodox Pharisee into a captive slave at the chariot wheels of his Lord and Master.

That the flesh and blood material of our Lord's Body evanesced, evaporated, sublimated, without undergoing corruption in the tomb between the burial and resurrection, is an older theory not long ago revived by Latham in his book called *The Risen Master*. And this thought may possibly throw light upon St. Paul's statement about all

undergoing *change*, whether dead or alive, at the Coming. But in our case the body does undergo dissolution and corruption; and that shews that the outer husk of our personal individuality here is only an *instrumentum* or temporary mode of expression of our truer self, which lives on through and after the experience of death.

T. Herbert Bindley.

THE EARLY DATE OF "GALATIANS": A REPLY.

As one whose mind has been for some years unsettled regarding the date of the Epistle to the Galatians, and for some months has been settling towards a date anterior to the Council of Jerusalem, I have read Mr. Maurice Jones' article in the September (1913) number of the Expositor with interest not unmingled with embarrassment. It is not that any of his arguments are exactly novel, but when massed together in this way, with the inferences to be drawn from them marshalled with considerable rhetorical force, they undoubtedly leave the impression after a first reading that he has good grounds for the confidence with which he rejects the early date. His presentation of the case gains further plausibility from the fact that as a holder of the south Galatian theory the early date has become a possibility for him, and as a champion of Luke as a credible historian it must have attractions for him on general grounds. Mr. Jones may therefore fairly be regarded as an impartial critic of the early date, and for that reason also his arguments deserve careful consideration. I may say at once that such consideration has convinced me that no one of Mr. Jones' objections to the early date is really cogent. It will be convenient to discuss them seriatim.

(*a*) "The question of time."

This resolves itself into the question whether there can have been a sufficient interval between Paul's return to Antioch after the first Missionary Tour and his departure for Jerusalem to allow for the creation within the Galatian Churches of the situation which called forth the Epistle, and further for the news of this change to reach the Apostle in Syria. And this breaks up into two subordinate questions: How long did Paul remain at Antioch? and How long would it take to bring about the new situation?

On the first point Mr. Jones is very decided. "All this happens within the space of four or five months." But does he not exaggerate, to the serious detriment of his case, both the degree of certainty attainable in such a matter, and the conclusions of the authorities to whom he refers? "All the systems of New Testament Chronology with which I am acquainted. Harnack's, Ramsay's, Turner's, and countless others, while they vary as to the particular year perhaps which saw the return of the Apostles to Syrian Antioch, at the close of the first Missionary journey, are absolutely at one in this, that six months is the extreme limit which you can allow between the arrival of Paul and Barnabas at Antioch and their arrival at Jerusalem prior to the holding of the Council." After reading that, it is not a little surprising to find on turning to Ramsay that he reckons the interval as extending from July to "Spring," and covering therefore not six months but at least eight and possibly nine.[1] And that must be understood to be Ramsay's minimum, for he adds elsewhere: "It was probably not less than a year after the Apostles had returned when they started for Jerusalem."[2] Neither is Mr. Jones' statement consistent with the conclusion to which Turner comes in his article on the Chronology.[3] For he brings the

[1] Ramsay, *Church in Roman Empire*, pp. 74, 168.
[2] Ibid. p. 75 *note*. [3] Hastings, *Bible Dictionary*, i. p. 422.

Missionaries back to Antioch S. in November, five months earlier than Ramsay; and though he does not reject Ramsay's reckoning, he points out that "the shorter estimate, if it satisfies Luke's language, and it seems to do so, is to be preferred on the ground it seems unlikely that the apostles on this their first missionary experiment should have separated themselves from their base at Antioch for so long a period as over two years." And this illustrates the second point, viz., that all these calculations are so hypothetical — depending on the number of days, weeks or months, spent at each several place, the possibility or the reverse of Paul's travelling in winter and so forth—that the totals arrived at in any case must be entirely provisional, But the point is that our two great English authorities[1] to whom Mr. Jones appeals give us a margin not of six months, but of nine, twelve or fifteen.

Would fifteen months be sufficient, or twelve? That again depends on how we conceive the situation in the Galatian Churches, and the way in which it had been brought about. Here also one is tempted to put a mark of interrogation after most of Mr. Jones' statements. We do not know that "the effect of this announcement [of Paul's success] was to rouse the Judaistic party in Antioch to immediate action": and much of what follows is likewise pure conjecture. So far from the Jewish propaganda being the effect of Paul's success made known at Antioch, it is quite possible that it had begun before he reached that city. There is no necessity for taking the occurrences recorded in Acts xv. 1 as wholly posterior to Paul's arrival, or the "judaising" activity as commencing only then. The

[1] It is possible that Harnack (the only other authority whom Mr. Jones mentions by name) gives better support to his contention: but I have not come across the passage. In the passage in the *Chronologie* (I. p. 238 f.), where he goes fully into the Pauline chronology, there is no reference to this particular question.

movement which we describe as "anti-Pauline" started in Jerusalem, and started in all probability quite independently of any report of his success. The question of the conditions on which the Gentiles might be admitted was no new one: it must have been before the Church for ten years or more. Men had taken sides upon it, and any missionary activity on the part of definitely Jewish Christians must have assumed a form which could be described in the words of Acts xv. 1: "And certain men had come down from Judæa and were teaching the brethren, Except ye be circumcised after the custom of Moses ye cannot be saved." It would be quite in Luke's manner thus to start a new stage of his history by picking up a dropped thread. And there is nothing inherently improbable in the suggestion that such representatives of the narrower view had reached Galatia even before Paul quitted the country. Considerations such as these seem quite sufficient to meet Mr. Jones' objection that "six months is an utterly inadequate period wherein to produce the situation and events which the Epistle to the Galatians imply." Moreover, it need not have been six months: it was probably twelve.

(*b*) "How are we to reconcile this date with Acts xv. 3?"

That is, how are we to reconcile the early date with the fact that, according to Luke, Paul and his companions "passed through both Phœnicia and Samaria, declaring the conversion of the Gentiles: "and they caused great joy unto all the brethren"? This is an artificial difficulty, due partly to an illegitimate narrowing of the reference to "Gentiles," and partly to an exaggeration of what had actually happened in Galatia. We are not concerned to deny that Paul's success in South Galatia would provide part of the evidence for "the turning of the Gentiles": but it is quite gratuitous to assume that it provided the whole. There was Antioch itself, represented in the company

itself by "certain others" of the Church, in all probability themselves Gentile Christians. If we may judge from the analogy of a modern missionary meeting, the appearance of these Gentile converts from Antioch would make even more impression than anything Paul might have to tell about his success in an unknown land.

But it was not either the scope of his work or the measure of his success which he and his companions "declared" to the "great joy" of all the brethren. It was the simple but all-significant fact that Gentiles also had "turned" to seek and to find a Saviour in the Messiah of the Jews. Nothing that had happened subsequently in Galatia could invalidate or even diminish that fact. How great a marvel it represented to Paul and to many of his contemporaries, we have continually to keep before our minds in studying the period. Moreover, supposing that Paul had already written his Epistle and despatched it, he may be credited with some confidence that it would not be without effect. He wrote it in keen anxiety: but he did not write it in despair. It is only this unjustifiable narrowing of the reference to the Churches of Galatia and this exaggerated representation of these as lost to Paul and to Paul's form of Christianity that causes any difficulty in reconciling this joyful proclamation with an early date for the Epistle. And as to Luke's silence on the subject, of what other Epistle do we find the occasion narrated or even hinted at in the Acts? For his silence on this occasion there are many possible explanations, such as the scope and scheme of his work, or the fact that Paul's journey to Jerusalem was quite sufficiently explained by the events at Antioch.

(*c*) "How is St. Paul's attitude at the Council to be explained if the Galatians were in open rebellion and this Epistle had been already written?"

This difficulty is similar in character to the previous one.

It is true that "the matter to be discussed by this assembly was the very question which lies at the heart of the Epistle to the Galatians." But it was at Antioch that it had first become pressing, and it was a deputation from the Church at Antioch which represented the Gentile cause at Jerusalem. One great advantage of the early date is that it makes it possible to put the "vacillation" of Peter at Antioch before the Council. This would become therefore part of the situation at Antioch which led to the sending of the deputation of which Paul was a member. No doubt the Galatian crisis would deepen the Apostle's anxiety for a settlement. But even that was only a specially distressing case of a general situation. And it is surely going quite beyond the record to describe it as a state of "open rebellion." The situation to which the Epistle is addressed, is rather one of genuine perplexity, the religious uneasiness of half-instructed converts, anxiety to know how Paul could meet the attack on his own authority, and the insinuations that the Gospel he had preached was incomplete. Of course these things carried with them the danger, the imminent danger, that the Galatian Christians might go over completely to Paul's opponents. But granted that the news of this situation reached Paul while he was at Antioch, he did the two things most clearly demanded by it. He despatched this letter in which he combines remonstrance, argument and appeal, and he proceeded himself to grapple with the difficulty at its source, in Jerusalem.

As to the part he took in the Council, it is again a gratuitous assumption that all he did was "to quote the undoubted success of his Mission among the cities of South Galatia," and a yet further assumption that what had happened in Galatia was of such a character as to preclude his appealing to his experiences there to show that the Gospel was "the power of God also to the Gentile." Whether the Apostle

sat "meek" in the Council ("silent" he certainly was not), or whether he displayed "pusillanimous conduct," is a matter of subjective opinion. At any rate he stated his case and gained his point. And perhaps the method he adopted of relating "all the signs and wonders which God had wrought through them among the Gentiles" was more effective than any amount of "burning indignation" would have been.

(*d*) "Could Timothy have been circumcised by Paul after the Epistle to the Galatians had been written?"

To deal fully with this objection would require much space; but it may be possible to state very briefly why it is not so conclusive as Mr. Jones believes. This circumcision of Timothy is a serious difficulty, if it be a difficulty at all, on any view as to the date of the Epistle. In the one case Paul wrote the Epistle containing all the sweeping sentences which Mr. Jones quotes and others to like effect, knowing that he would be met with the easy retort: Then why did you cause Timothy to be circumcised? In the other case, if the Epistle is early, he wrote the same sentences, and then, in spite of them, caused Timothy to be circumcised. For my part, there seems little indeed to choose between these alternatives on the ground of the intrinsic improbability of either. On the surface they seem to involve the Apostle equally in self-contradiction. And the inference I should draw is that it is impossible to make any effective use of this action of Paul as bearing on the date of the Epistle. If the Apostle "stultified himself by circumcising Timothy in the district of South Galatia within a few months after he had written the Galatian Epistle," he stultified himself no less if he wrote the Epistle to the very Churches to which he had introduced Timothy as a half-Gentile circumcised at his instance.

But did he "stultify himself"? The assumption which

underlies such a statement is one which is far too common, namely, that Paul's criticism of the Law involved or amounted to its equal and entire abrogation for Gentile Christians, for himself, and for Jews who became Christians. It is, on this assumption alone that there rests the charge of inconsistency or time-serving so freely launched against the Apostle whenever he is found conforming to some practice of the ceremonial law. It ought not to be so difficult to understand that what Paul joyfully discovered to have come to an end was the Law as the system or principle on which the relation between God and man was based and ordered. It was the Law in its quality of encouraging men to "trust in themselves that they were righteous" to build up and assert a claim on the Divine favour and forgiveness, of which Christ was "the end." To use phraseology familiar in another connexion, the Law was no longer of the *esse* of the relationship with God, but it did not cease to be of the *bene esse*, some parts of it for Jews and Gentiles alike, other parts besides for those who had been born Jews. Paul's contending was with those who, because they did not understand the change wrought by Christ, sought to make the keeping of the whole Law *de fide* for all Christians, and so to make it part of the *esse* of the relationship with God.

One might find a useful illustration in the Foreign Mission field. It might be harmless (many of our wisest missionaries think it would) for Chinese converts to Christianity to continue the practice of ancestor-veneration.[1] But it would be a serious mistake, involving a perversion of the Christian Gospel, for such converts to insist that only those, whether Chinese or non-Chinese, who practised ancestor-veneration,

[1] I write "ancestor-*Veneration*," not forgetting that what has been the practice in China is commonly described as "ancestor-*worship*." The substitution of the one for the other is (1) what first missionaries as I refer to have in view, (2) what would be a natural result of accepting Christianity, and (3) illustrates rather strikingly what I conceive to have been the effect of Paul's faith in Christ on his attitude to the Law.

were truly in the way of salvation. In face of such an assertion a Chinese Paul would vehemently maintain the liberty of non-Chinese to abstain from ancestor-veneration, and yet to possess all the fulness of Christian salvation and experience. But the same Chinese Paul, who had himself been trained in the practice, might without any inconsistency continue it for himself even while vindicating the liberty of others. That might indeed be the action of a large-hearted, open-eyed man: but if it were otherwise, it would not be the action of a Paul.

There is thus no reason to suppose that Paul either believed or taught that even the ceremonial law had been cancelled as regards himself or his fellow-believers who were also Jews. But for them its character had been completely changed, and with its character their relation to it. It had become something in the observance of which they might be guided by circumstances; it was not an end, but a means. That Paul caused Timothy to be circumcised shows neither inconsistency nor vacillation. It simply means that he recognised Timothy to be to all intents and purposes a Jew, yet without the outward sign, and seeing no objection in principle, provided it was clearly understood that circumcision made no difference in a man's standing with God, caused him to be circumcised because it was expedient for the work he was called to do.[1]

I do not propose to deal with the two further objections raised by Mr. Jones on the ground of internal evidence. He himself does not desire "to attach too much weight to them." Of course there is a very simple explanation of the fact that according to the Epistle "Paul himself is the important personage," and "it is his figure that fills the foreground of the picture." It is surely quite unnecessary to postulate lapse of time and changed conditions in order to account

[1] Cf. Hort, *Christian Ecclesia*, p. 180: also *Jewish Christianity*, p. 86.

for this, when it was Paul who had been attacked, Paul whose relation with the older Apostles it was important to describe, Paul, whose "gospel" was in question. There is as little ground for deducing from the language of the Epistle that when it was written Barnabas was "of only secondary importance" as there is for deducing from Acts xi. 29, 30 that the relationship between Barnabas and Paul was at the time there referred to "in some way that of patron and client."

It has been acknowledged that Mr. Jones puts his objections with vividness and vigour, and just for that reason it seemed worth while to examine them. But after examination they do not appear either singly or collectively to militate against the early date of the Epistle. The really serious difficulty lies, as Professor Lake has pointed out, in the literary relationship with the Epistle to the Romans.

C. Anderson Scott.

NOTE ON THE ARTICLE "TRANSMISSION OF THE GOSPEL."

The explanation (p. 89) of the *right* cheek in Matthew v. 39 is most ingenious; but the Lewisian text omits the word *right*, having only "whosoever smiteth thee on thy cheek." The source of the word *right* was excellently detected by Merx. It comes from the *right hand* of v. 30, omitted (with the whole verse) in the Lewisian, doubtless accidentally; the *right hand* is more important than the left, but this is not the case with the cheek.

In Mark vi. 40 we read ἀνέπεσαν πρασιαὶ πρασιαί, "they reclined garden-beds, garden-beds," a difficult expression. But when we discover the Syriac for "garden-bed," the difficulty vanishes. That word is משכבתא, as appears from *Thesaurus Syriacus*, col. 4147, in Arabic *maskabah* (Dozy, *Supplément*, i. 666). But in the text followed by Mark it was not used in its Syriac sense "garden-beds," but in its Hebrew sense *couches*, *lyings-down*, i.e. companies. It would appear that the Syriac word is derived from שכב in its Arabic sense, whence a *maskabah* means properly something watered. It is curious that this ancient word is condemned as a modernism by a recent Syrian writer on the vernacular.

D. S. Margoliouth.

HARNACK ON THE DATES OF THE ACTS AND SYNOPTIC GOSPELS.

The most conspicuous efforts of New Testament criticism of the advanced type in the nineteenth century were directed to prove that the book as a whole, excluding a few of the Pauline Epistles, was the product of the second, rather than the first, century of the Christian era. The more normal criticism of the last century, however, recognised in the Pauline correspondence, with the possible exception of the Pastoral Epistles, the genuine outcome of the Apostle's missionary labours between 50 and 66 A.D. but regarded the twenty years which followed the destruction of Jerusalem, i.e. the period between 70 and 90 A.D., as the golden age of early Christian *historical* literature. To this period were assigned the Synoptic Gospels, The Acts of the Apostles, and the Apocalpyse, which is, in some sense, a historical document of the highest value. The views of the advanced school do not in the present day command much respect, and the attitude of criticism as a whole towards the question of the chronology of the books of the New Testament remains much what it was in the preceding century. There has, however, in the last few years come into view a tendency, due perhaps to a natural reaction against the unwarranted conclusions of the extreme criticism of the previous generation, to push back the period of Christian historical activity and to place its achievements in the years preceding 70 A.D. and not in the two decades following that date. The most notable illustration of this tendency is undoubtedly furnished

by Harnack, who in his recent book on *The Dates of the Acts and the Synoptic Gospels* assigns to the Gospel of St. Mark a date earlier than 60 A.D., and maintains that St. Luke's Gospel and the Acts must both have been written before the final trial and death of St. Paul. In this, which is his latest contribution to the subject, he, therefore, turns his back completely upon all the conclusions that he had formulated with regard to the dates of these books in his well-known work on *The Chronology of the Early Christian Literature*. Harnack had already, in his book on *The Acts of the Apostles*, published in 1908, hinted at his possible conversion to the view that it must have been composed before the close of St. Paul's life. In his later volume of the *Beiträge zur Einleitung in das N.T.* (1911), quoted above, a further advance is noticeable, and he now unhesitatingly proclaims his adhesion to the new theory and devotes a considerable section of that volume to the elucidation and proof of it. His exhaustive examination of the Lucan writings, the results of which were published in *St. Luke the Physician* and *The Acts of the Apostles*, seems to have convinced him that the internal evidence provided by the Acts itself demands this early date. Now this necessarily implies still earlier dates for the second and third Gospels, and Harnack maintains that there is no insuperable difficulty in placing St. Luke's Gospel between the years 60 and 65 A.D., and is of opinion that the Gospel of St. Mark may well have been written before the year 60. His conclusions have been accepted by some German scholars of repute, such as Delbruck and Maurenbrecher, and it is interesting to note that in the latest *Introduction to the New Testament* produced in this country, that of Allen and Grensted (T. and T. Clark, 1913) the dates of all three documents are placed even earlier than those assigned to them by Harnack. Thus St. Mark's Gospel is said to have been

written as early as 44 A.D. in Aramaic, and then to have been translated into Greek by the Evangelist himself at Antioch before the year 50. St. Luke's Gospel is also assigned by these scholars to the years 55–58 A.D., while the Acts is asserted to have been written during St. Paul's Roman imprisonment.

I. The main reason responsible for Harnack's change of view as to the date of the Acts may be expressed in his own words, "The concluding verses of the Acts of the Apostles, taken in conjunction with the absence of any reference in the book to the result of the trial of St. Paul and to his martyrdom, make it in the highest degree probable that the work was written at a time when St. Paul's trial in Rome had not yet come to an end."[1] This high degree of probability, he maintains, becomes an assured certainty when the contents of the Acts are closely studied, and he adduces the following further grounds for demanding a comparatively early date for the book.

II. *Negative Evidence.*

(1) There is no trace to be discovered in the Acts of the rebellion of the Jews in the seventh decade of the century, of the destruction of Jerusalem and of the Temple, of Nero's persecution of the Christians.[1]

(2) No use is made in the Acts of the Pauline Epistles.[2]

(3) The passage in Acts xx. 25, where St. Paul prophesied that the Ephesian elders should see his face no more, could not have remained in the book if St. Luke had known that the Apostle had actually paid a later visit to those regions (2 Tim. iv. 13). The book must, therefore, have been written before the Apostle's release and subsequent journey to Asia.[3]

III. *Positive Evidence.*

(1) The Christological terminology of the Acts.[4]

[1] *The Date of the Acts and Synoptic Gospels*, p. 99.
[2] Ibid. p. 100. [3] Ibid. p. 103. [4] Ibid. pp. 103–110.

(2) The employment of the terms[1] *οἱ Χριστιανοί*; *οἱ μαθηταί*; *ἡ ἐκκλησία*; *ὁ λαὸς τοῦ θεοῦ*; *ἡ παροικία*, *πάροικοι*.

(3) St. Luke's use of the phrase "the first day of the week" to denote Sunday, and the employment of the Jewish Calendar in fixing dates.[2]

Out of this fairly copious material Harnack has evolved a body of proof which is, at first sight, decidedly formidable. It has at any rate brought conviction to his own mind that the Acts taken by itself requires that its composition should be set before the destruction of Jerusalem and the death of St. Paul. I propose in the course of this paper to examine closely each separate item of this somewhat elaborate demonstration with the view of discovering whether the evidence brought forward by Harnack justifies the very dogmatic conclusion expressed by him as to the date of the Acts.

I. *The argument based upon the concluding verses of the Acts and the absence of any reference in the book to the trial and martyrdom of St. Paul.*

Harnack concludes that the Acts was written very soon after the close of the *διετία ὅλη* mentioned in xxviii. 30, when St. Paul left his hired lodging, either to enjoy a further period of freedom (as he thinks), or to have his situation of comparative liberty exchanged for one of greater restriction, which was only the prelude to his trial and death. His principal reason for placing the composition of the book at this point is that for eight whole chapters St. Luke keeps his readers intensely interested in the progress of the Apostle's trial, and that it is inconceivable that a writer possessing his undoubted historical gifts and insight could have brought his readers so far only to disappoint them completely by closing his narrative without the slightest reference to the Apostle's subsequent fate. He declares that such a pro-

[1] Ibid. pp. 110–113.
[2] Ibid. pp. 113–114.

cedure would have been as indefensible as if the Gospel story had closed with the appearance of our Lord before Pilate and had had nothing to tell us concerning the Crucifixion. The complete lack of reference to the final scenes in the career of St. Paul can only, therefore, according to Harnack, be due to the fact that when St. Luke completed the book the trial and death were still in the future. In further support of this conclusion he urges the fact that nowhere in the Acts is either St. Paul or St. Peter so treated as if his death was presupposed, although St. Luke was by no means averse to foretelling or prophesying in other connexions.

The abrupt and apparently indeterminate close of the Acts has always constituted a difficult problem, and the solutions offered have been many and ingenious. Some scholars find the suggestion that St. Luke intended to write a third book to complete his history of the dawn of Christianity attractive, and they lay much stress upon the use of πρῶτος to describe his Gospel in Acts i. 1 as supporting their theory. Others again opine that the historian himself may have met with a violent death in the persecution under Domitian before the book was completely finished. A plausible suggestion is that when St. Luke arrived at this point he found that his MS. roll had reached the length which was accounted normal in those days and that he was unwilling to add to it. It appears to me, however, that Harnack himself has supplied the most satisfactory explanation of the difficulty, and an explanation which does away with the necessity of placing the completion of the book before the death of St. Paul. In his masterly introduction to *The Acts of the Apostles* he describes the purpose of St. Luke in writing the Acts in the following words: "It was to show how the power of the Spirit of Jesus in the Apostles founded the Primitive Christian community, called into being the mission to the Gentiles, conducted the Gospel from Jerusalem to Rome, and

set the receptive Gentile world in the place of the Jewish nation which hardened its heart more and more against the appeal of Christianity."[1] A few pages further on in the same book he remarks that "St Luke . . . in his narrative of the propagation of the Gospel is satisfied with describing only *its progress across the world from Jerusalem to Rome.*"[2]

Now Harnack's description of St. Luke's purpose in the Acts is in reality only a paraphrase of St. Luke's own very clear and definite statement on the point given in Acts i.8, "Ye shall be witnesses unto me, both in Jerusalem, and in all Judæa, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost parts of the earth." The name attached to the book from the earliest ages, viz., "The Acts of the Apostles" has been a prolific source of misconception in regard to its primary object. To describe its contents as "The Acts of the Apostles" is to ascribe to it a purpose which was not contemplated by the writer. It certainly does relate the deeds and actions of some of the Apostles, but even so only as far as they contributed to what is after all the main theme of the historian, viz., the expansion of Christianity along Imperial lines, or, as Harnack has well put it, "the progress of the Gospel across the world from Jerusalem to Rome." Every other consideration is strictly subordinated to this one governing motive. A very cursory study of the manner in which St. Luke deals with every notable personality introduced into the narrative shows clearly that he did not set out to write biographies of the Apostles, not even of St. Peter and St. Paul. The characters in the drama of the Acts are only of interest to him as instruments in God's hands in the accomplishment of the one great purpose. St. Peter, St. Stephen, St. Philip, St. Barnabas, and St. Paul all in turn play a leading rôle, and

[1] Op. cit. p. xxx.
[2] Op. cit. p. xxxv.

each one retires from the scene the instant that his own appropriate contribution to the movement as a whole is complete. The following brief sketches of the work in the Acts accomplished by each one of these Christian pioneers as related will suffice to establish the truth of this statement.

St. Peter.

St. Peter must from his very position as the leader of the Twelve occupy a prominent position in any trustworthy historical account of the beginnings of Christianity. He is of primary interest, however, to the writer of the Acts because he was largely instrumental in making the first Christian approach to the non-Jewish world, and thus became a factor of first-rate importance in the expansion of the Kingdom. The incidents selected for recital in the Acts point clearly in this direction. We are told of his preaching on the day of Pentecost whereby the seeds of the Gospel were scattered to every part of the Roman Empire. The remaining events connected with his work in Jerusalem are related mainly to explain the rising hostility of the Jewish hierarchy against the Apostles which eventually led to their departure from the Holy City, and so indirectly led to the further dispersion of the Christian faith. To St. Luke much the most important incident in the career of St. Peter is his mission to Cornelius, which he has described with a perfect wealth of detail, and of this he has given us two independent versions. The closing scene, as far as the Acts is concerned, viz., his imprisonment by Herod and his subsequent deliverance, is inserted because it formed the prelude to his definite departure from Jerusalem and to his work on a wider scale than that afforded by the Jewish community in and around that city. In the case of St. Peter, therefore, interest is concentrated upon those events in his life which illustrate the gradual advance of Christianity, first of all in Jerusalem and the more immediate neighbourhood, and then, owing to

the pressure of circumstances, in an ever widening circle of which we have only the mere beginnings in the Acts. What this means is that to St. Luke St. Peter is of importance only as long as he remains the principal agent in the expansion of Christianity. When another and a mightier than he arose he disappears completely from the scene, and his name is only mentioned in one context in the remainder of the book, and that, significantly enough, in connexion with the burning question of the terms of admission of Gentiles into the Christian fold.

St. Stephen.

The story of St. Stephen is related because it marked a critical epoch in the growth of the Church. It affords a striking illustration of the prominent part assumed henceforth by the Hellenistic Jews in the history of early Christianity, while the martyrdom itself explained the wide dispersion of the Christians of Jerusalem in Phœnicia, Cyprus and Antioch, and the all-important effect of this movement upon the fortunes of the Church.

St. Philip.

The comparatively modest position assigned to St. Philip is in strict proportion to the value of his contribution to the world-wide mission of Christianity. He was apparently the first to bring the Christian Gospel within reach of the cities of Samaria, and was subsequently the agent in the conversion of the Ethiopian eunuch, an incident which may have had far-reaching results. His name appears again once in the Acts, but only as the host of St. Paul.

St. Barnabas.

That the main interest of Barnabas for the writer of the Acts consisted in his association with St. Paul is made perfectly clear by the fact that once the partnership between the two is severed Barnabas' name is not mentioned again in the book. He rendered valuable services, however,

to the cause which Luke had so much at heart. The Church at Antioch, the very centre of the Gentile missionary movement, owed much to his insight and activity, and, more than all, the discovery of St. Paul and the right appreciation of his ability and energy were, from a strictly human point of view, entirely due to St. Barnabas. The joint labours of the two missionary Apostles are recorded with great fullness by St. Luke, who clearly recognises in them steps of the most momentous character towards the fulfilment of the great purpose of his narrative. But the moment the path of Barnabas diverges from that of Paul his future movements possess no meaning for the historian, and he now confines his narrative exclusively to St. Paul and his work, and that because the great Apostle is working on Imperial lines and has now become infinitely the strongest factor in the expansion of the Kingdom of Christ.

In every one of the cases cited it is quite apparent that the personalities are of interest and importance to St. Luke only as long as they occupy a position of prominence in the great drama of the mission of the Church to the great Roman world, and that their relative values are in strict proportion to the extent and character of the services rendered by them in this particular cause.

St. Paul.

When we come to consider St. Paul's place in the narrative we find that St. Luke's method of dealing with other characters is strictly followed in his case also. St. Paul's career and work are undoubtedly treated with exceptional fullness and detail, but this is due, partly, to St. Luke's more intimate knowledge of the Apostle, but chiefly to the immeasurable value of his contribution to the evangelising of the world. He enters largely into biographical *minutiæ* because a knowledge of the man was essential to the right appreciation of his work. Then again he was

personally acquainted with him, had been his close companion for years, and was a devoted admirer of his qualities and character. But even here it is not so much Paul the man as Paul the Apostle of the Gentiles, Paul the Christian missionary who carried the torch of the Gospel through the great cities of the Imperial provinces and finally planted it in the Imperial capital itself, who captures his imagination. It is upon Paul as the main instrument in the progress of the Gospel across the world from Jerusalem to Rome that his attention is concentrated. In this respect, therefore, St. Luke's method of dealing with St. Paul is exactly parallel with his treatment of the less prominent characters that he introduces into the Acts. Every personality is of interest and importance only as far and as long as he is contributing his share towards the accomplishment of the great purpose which it is the ruling motive of the book to describe. When that object is achieved by the arrival of the Gospel at Rome in the person of its greatest representative St. Luke's work is complete, and even the final scenes in St. Paul's life are no longer relevant and find no place in the narrative.

It seems to me, therefore, that no argument in favour of an early date for the Acts can be based upon the closing verses of the book. St. Luke's method all through the book makes it easily conceivable that he brought the Acts to a close at this particular point, not because the Apostle's trial and death had not yet taken place, but because his primary purpose had been achieved and the remaining incidents in the Apostle's life were no longer relevant.

II. (1) *St. Luke's silence regarding the Jewish wars and the destruction of Jerusalem.*

If St. Luke's purpose was achieved with the arrival of St. Paul in Rome this would dispose of Harnack's argument from his silence concerning the rebellion of the Jews and the fall of Jerusalem. These events were subsequent to the

διετία ὅλη with which the narrative closes, and, therefore, did not come within Luke's purview. Besides, St. Luke was never interested in the Jews *quâ* Jews, but only as far as they helped or hindered the expansion of Christianity. The Jewish rebellion and its consequences were principally matters of national concern, and, as such, made no very effective appeal to his sympathy or imagination. It is true that he represents the Jews as persecutors rather than persecuted, but this is only another instance of his accuracy as a historian. He does not read into the fifth and sixth decades of the first century the conditions of the seventh and eighth, but is content to describe the situation exactly as it existed.

(2) *The non-employment of the Pauline Epistles in the Acts.*

Harnack maintains that it cannot be proved that the author of the Acts has made any use either of any particular Epistle, or of the collected Epistles, of St. Paul, and that the book, in consequence, must have been written at a time when the Pauline correspondence was not widely known in the Church. This, he asserts, could not have been the case as late as the years 70–80 A.D. Now it is probably true that St. Luke did not make any extensive use of St. Paul's letters, although many scholars of mark, such as Ramsay and Holtzmann, argue strongly that he did. But the fact that he made no use of them does not necessarily imply that he was not acquainted with the letters. I find it difficult to understand how St. Luke could possibly have failed to possess a very real knowledge of most, if not of all, the Epistles. He had been a close companion of the Apostle for at least twelve years, and the Acts shows that, with the exception of the Church of Colossæ, and of Philemon and Titus, he had ample information at his command as to the fortunes of those to whom the letters are addressed. He was probably a Macedonian, and specially connected with Philippi, and was presumably keenly interested in the affairs of the neighbouring

Church of Thessalonica. He was actually present when St. Paul addressed the elders of the Church of Ephesus at Miletus. It is more than probable that he was resident at Cæsarea during the greater portion of the Apostle's imprisonment in that city. He shared with him the experiences and dangers of that long voyage from Cæsarea to Rome, and was certainly in Rome itself at the beginning and towards the close of the Roman imprisonment. It is well nigh impossible to believe that during this long period of the most intimate intercourse with St. Paul he could have remained ignorant of what chiefly occupied the Apostle's mind, viz., "the care of all the Churches." The frequent references in the Epistles to his companions, the way in which he associates them with himself, make it perfectly evident that there was no reserve on the Apostle's part, no hiding within his own breast of the anxieties and difficulties which proved such a heavy burden. How then could so intimate a companion and so tried a friend as St. Luke was remain in ignorance of the Apostle's correspondence with the Churches? I am not concerned to explain why St. Luke thought well to write the Acts without making any substantial use of St. Paul's Epistles, but it appears to me that it ought to be self-evident that it was not because he was not acquainted with them. I cannot, therefore, allow that the fact that he did not use the Epistles to any appreciable extent in the composition of the Acts proves anything as to the date when St. Luke wrote the book.

(3) *The Prophecy in Acts xx.* 25.

In view of the very serious divergence of opinion upon the question of St. Paul's release from his imprisonment at Rome and his subsequent journey to Asia the argument which Harnack bases upon this verse is of little moment. If the Apostle's imprisonment closed with his trial and death, as a very large and increasing body of scholars now maintains to have been the case, the prophecy is of no consequence in

determining the date of the Acts, as Harnack himself admits. It is somewhat surprising to find him attaching any weight to a statement of fact in the Second Epistle to Timothy when he is known as a strenuous opponent of the Pauline authorship, and, consequently, of the genuineness of the Pastoral Epistles.

III. *The Positive evidence for an early date of the Acts.*

(1) *The Christological terminology of the book.*

We will now consider the positive evidence adduced by Harnack in support of his theory. In this department stress is laid principally upon the *terminology* of the book as pointing to a phase of Christian teaching and writing which was primitive rather than post-Pauline.

(*a*) *The use of ὁ Χριστός.*

There seems no reason to question Harnack's contention that in the Acts "Christ" is not a proper name as in most of the Pauline and post-Pauline literature, but still retains the more primitive meaning of the "Messiah." He quotes fourteen passages in the book in every one of which ὁ Χριστός means the "Messiah" and never has the signification of a proper name. Now out of these fourteen passages no less than eight come from the first nine chapters, where, as Harnack himself acknowledges, St. Luke is dependent upon original and primitive sources. Of these eight, four, viz. ii. 31, 36, iii. 18, 20, occur in St. Peter's speeches; iv. 26 is a quotation from one of the Psalms; v. 42 is a description of the Apostles' preaching in the Temple; viii. 5 gives the contents of Philip's preaching to the Samaritans; and ix. 22 tells us how Saul confounded the Jews in Damascus "proving that this is the Christ."

Six passages remain, and of these five are found in contexts where St. Luke is describing the character of St. Paul's preaching, either in his actual words, or in *oratio obliqua* as e.g.:

1. xvii. 2 (twice), to the Jews of Thessalonica;
2. xviii. 5, to the Jews of Corinth;
3. xxiv. 24, to Felix and Drusilla (who was a Jewess);
4. xxvi. 23, before Herod (also a Jew) at Cæsarea;
5. while xviii. 28 gives us a résumé of Apollos's preaching to the Jews at Ephesus.

The two following facts then emerge out of our examination of these fourteen passages.

1. In every single case where the title ὁ Χριστός is found in the Acts St. Luke is reproducing, directly or indirectly, the utterances of others, and in no case is it found incorporated in his own narrative proper. In the great majority of instances he is simply recording either the *ipsissima verba* or the substance of the preaching of the great Apostles St. Peter and St. Paul.

2. In every single instance the use of the title is associated with the preaching of the Gospel to *Jews*,[1] where the Messianic signification was the natural, and indeed the only possible one. And even if we allow that the speeches and sermons in the Acts are to some extent the free compositions of St. Luke (a contention that I am not prepared to accept), it is quite evident that he was in every case careful to reproduce the true atmosphere of the speech or sermon, and there is no room to doubt that in the matter of the use of ὁ Χριστός he has recorded the identical words used by the respective speakers.

The use of this term in the Acts, therefore, gives no real clue to St. Luke's own Christological terminology. In every instance brought forward by Harnack the term is not his own, but that of his sources.

(*b*) The use of ὁ παῖς θεοῦ and ὁ ἴδιος.

[1] Even in Acts xxiv. 24 and xxvi, 23 it is to the Jewish training and sympathies of Drusilla in the one instance and of Herod in the other that the Apostle makes his particular appeal.

The remark in the previous paragraph is substantially true of the other Christological expressions adduced by Harnack as evidence of St. Luke's primitive Christology. Thus ὁ παῖς θεοῦ is found four times in the Acts, and of these two occur in a sermon of St. Peter's (iii. 13, 26), and two in the prayer of the infant Church of Jerusalem (iv. 27, 30). Again, the use of ὁ ἴδιος, which in later Christian literature was replaced by the term ὁ μονογενής, is limited to one passage in St. Paul's address to the elders at Miletus, an address which Harnack himself acknowledges to be the most Pauline of all the Apostle's utterances recorded in the Acts. This particular usage is, therefore, Pauline and not Lucan.

(*c*) Finally the only passages which Harnack quotes to prove his contention that in the Acts the Messiah is represented as yet to come, are taken from St. Peter's addresses at Jerusalem (ii. 22 and iii. 20), and to Cornelius (x. 38), and from St. Paul's sermon to the Jews of Pisidian Antioch (xiii. 33).

The whole of his argument from the Christological language of the Acts is, therefore, not based upon St. Luke's own usage, but upon that of his source, and must, in consequence, be set aside as irrelevant. The evidence that he brings forward in this connexion merely emphasises St. Luke's fidelity to his sources and his carefulness as a historian.

(2) *The use of the expressions* οἱ Χριστιανοί; οἱ μαθηταί; ἡ ἐκκλησία; ὁ λαὸς τοῦ θεοῦ; ἡ παροικία, πάροικοι.

In this section of his proof Harnack is on somewhat safer ground when he maintains that certain terms used in the Acts disappear soon after the Pauline period, but of the four expressions quoted by him in this connexion the only two that really help him are οἱ μαθηταί and ἡ ἐκκλησία (to denote an assembly not strictly Christian), for the remaining two, ὁ λαὸς τοῦ θεοῦ and παροικία, πάροικοι, are exclusively confined to public utterances recorded by St. Luke.

With respect to οἱ Χριστιανοί Harnack argues that the manner in which this term is introduced by St. Luke shows that the name " Christian " was not yet applied by believers to themselves, but was attached to them from outside, as against the practice which, according to the evidence of 1 St. Peter, was in vogue in later days, when the term had become the normal designation of believers in the Church itself.

The whole of the evidence based by Harnack upon the terminology of the Acts is thus reduced to almost infinitesimal proportions, and amounts to little more than that a primitive term like οἱ μαθηταί is still in use, that ἡ ἐκκλησία does not yet necessarily imply a Christian assembly, and that believers had not yet normally applied to themselves the designation of Christians.

(3) The final argument brought forward by him is that St. Luke calls Sunday " the first day of the week," and not " the Lord's day," which, according to him, was the usual designation well before the end of the first century. To this he adds also the fact that the Evangelist, although a Gentile Christian writing for Gentile Christians, makes use of Jewish Feasts and of the Jewish Calendar in fixing dates, and refers to Jewish religious customs, and does this in a way which presupposes that his readers are conversant with all these things. From these data Harnack deduces the conclusion that St. Luke must have written at a time when the great majority of Gentile Christians consisted of those who had previously been in more or less close intercourse with the Synagogue, and this could only have been at the beginning of the mission to the Gentiles.

The designation of Sunday by the phrase " the first day of the week " in the Acts cannot be said to afford any indication of the date of the book. It is the customary New Testament title, to which there is only one exception, viz. Revela-

tion i. 10, and this single occurrence of the later designation hardly warrants the dogmatic assertion that it must have entirely superseded the earlier phrase well before the end of the first century. As a matter of fact the evidence of the Fourth Gospel, written much later than the period usually assigned to the Acts, in which the designation " the first day of the week " is found, proves the exact contrary. It is also most significant that in the reproduction of this identical passage from the Fourth Gospel in the apocryphal Gospel of St. Peter the earlier designation has been replaced by the later, a conclusive proof that the process which Harnack associates with the closing decades of the first century really belongs to the second.

The references to Jewish religious customs and to Jewish points of time are undoubtedly fairly frequent in the Acts, and are found, as Harnack remarks, not only in the earlier Chapters, where St. Luke was dependent upon Jewish Christian sources, but also in the second half of the book and even in the " we- " sections. The references in the first section of the book were probably copied from his sources, while many of the later ones are explained by the fact that they were absolutely essential for the due understanding of the narrative. Thus, e.g., the mention of the Passover and of the Pentecost in Acts xx. 6 and 16, became necessary in order to explain St. Paul's movements, while the incident of the vow and its conditions had the most important bearing upon the fate of the Apostle and upon his subsequent removal to Rome, which, as we have seen, was the climax of St. Luke's narrative.

Again, the question of the extent and character of the Gentile Christian's acquaintance with, and interest in, things Jewish is one of the most strongly disputed points of modern New Testament criticism. When we find a very powerful and authoritative body of opinion in favour of the hypo-

thesis that the Epistle to the Hebrews, in which the whole trend of the argument is exclusively based upon the Old Testament and the details of the Levitical ritual, was addressed to a Gentile Christian community, there is not much difficulty in conceiving that the Gentile Christians for whom St. Luke wrote the Acts, much at the same period, were familiar enough with such matters as the great Jewish feasts and the day of Atonement.

To sum up, then, it appears that the evidence adduced by Harnack from the contents of the Acts itself is not of sufficient weight to justify his assertion that the book must have been written before the death of St. Paul. The peculiar and abrupt termination is adequately explained by the motive which governed the writing, to which the closing scenes of St. Paul's work and life were not essential. The terminology, Christological and otherwise, is, with the exception of two or three words, not St. Luke's own, but that of his sources. The use of the phrase "the first day of the week" to designate Sunday is found in writings much later than those of the period to which the Acts is generally assigned, and it is evident that the designation was not entirely abandoned until the second century. The argument based upon the use of the Jewish Calendar and the frequent references to Jewish religious customs is much too precarious a foundation for the important conclusion based upon it.

I am not prepared to assert positively that the Acts could not have been written before the death of St. Paul, but a detailed examination of Harnack's proof has demonstrated clearly that the contents of the book do not demand such a date.

The Date of St. Luke's Gospel.

If Harnack had successfully demonstrated that the internal evidence of the Acts is conclusively in favour of the early date this would avail him nothing unless he can also prove

that the Gospels of St. Luke and St. Mark were already in existence before the year 65 A.D. There is no inherent difficulty in dating the Second Gospel before the year 60, but Harnack's attempt to push back the date of the Third Gospel to the early years of the seventh decade is not more convincing that his similar effort with reference to the Acts. The voice of criticism is all but unanimous in its opposition to him on this point. He does not seem to appreciate the momentous significance of the changes which appear in St. Luke's version of the apocalyptic section as compared with those found in the other two Synoptists, which, in the opinion of the great majority of scholars, point definitely to a period later than the destruction of Jerusalem. He curtly dismisses the suggestion that St. Luke may have been acquainted with the works of Josephus, although a writer like Stanton, whose standpoint no one would describe as unduly advanced, acknowledges that he may well have read the earlier works of the Jewish historian. Finally he fails to dispose of the difficulty associated with St. Luke's declaration that " many have taken in hand to draw up a narrative " if he was writing before the year 65.

The Date of St. Mark's Gospel.

The tradition that St. Mark's Gospel was published in Rome after the death of St. Peter and St. Paul, is so definite and so widely authenticated that it is extremely difficult to set it aside. On the other hand, the tradition may only refer to the Gospel in its latest form, which is the form extant in our New Testament, and it is more than possible that other versions were in existence many years before this. As it is now generally agreed that St. Luke did not make use of our St. Mark, but of an earlier and less complete edition of it, we need not question Harnack's contention that he may have been in possession of a copy of the Marcan document in the early years of the seventh decade of the first century.

We are left, therefore, with the following deductions as the result of our examination of Harnack's argument in favour of a date for the Acts previous to the death of St. Paul.

1. The Gospel of St Mark, in the version incorporated by St. Luke in his own Gospel, was probably available as early as the year 60 A.D.

2. The preponderance of evidence is decidedly against the hypothesis that St. Luke's Gospel was written before the destruction of Jerusalem.

3. The evidence adduced by Harnack from the Acts itself does not justify his assertion that we must place its composition before the destruction of Jerusalem and the death of St. Paul.

MAURICE JONES.

STUDIES IN CHRISTIAN ESCHATOLOGY.

II. Objections on the Threshold.

Exception has been taken to the pursuit of eschatology on various grounds. It is opposed in the name of spiritual religion, of science, of ethics, and finally on behalf of a particular view of knowledge. We shall consider each of these in turn, starting with the religious veto, since, if the thought of future destiny is actually irrelevant to faith in the living God, there is no need to go on.

The religious case against eschatology is best put in an early work of Schleiermacher. Addressing "the cultured despisers of religion" in 1799, he writes: "You still believe in a personal God and in personal immortality. I see: unlike myself, you are still pupils of the *Aufklärung*. Even of these conceptions I have no need in order to unveil before you the sublime beauty and divinity of religion. My God is the Universe, the Unity of the All. . . . Besides, your personal immortality outside time and behind time is in truth no immortality at all. Only he who surrenders personality, which is perishable, to God the Eternal, has true or genuine immortality. In the midst of finitude to be one with the Infinite and in every moment to be eternal—this is the immortality of religion. Therefore strive even here to annihilate your personality, and to live in the One and All; strive to be more than yourself, so that when you lose yourself, you may lose but little." In notes to a later edition of the *Reden*, Schleiermacher pleads that in this passage he was discarding merely a sensuous and egoistic form of belief in survival. When writing, as he explained, he was thinking of the fact that Old Testament saints had no such belief and that religious feeling is concerned more with the present than the future. He therefore thought himself justified in point-

ing out that the hope of immortality was not so essential to piety that both stand or fall together.

The argument, on the whole, is that interest in the world to come is a mark of unspirituality. We are sure of God now and here, and nothing else really counts. There is a dawning sense of this in the Fourth Gospel, the writer of which over and over again repeats the truth that the believer has eternal life now.

In point of fact, the Fourth Gospel dwells on the future life more than any of the Synoptics. But apart from this, the religious mood typically expressed by Schleiermacher is very imperfectly moralised. It operates with a comparatively unethical thought of God. Eschatology is of course mere foolishness if God and the Universe are two names for one thing. There is no more reason why the impersonal system of things should preserve or redeem souls than why in opening spring it should raise the leaves from the winter mould, and give them another season of green beauty. A partially moral God is always precarious ; caprice may leave men to the dust. The conception of man, too, is unethical. From the purely artistic or lyric point of view man is a piece of nature ; and to the artist one of the chief values of man is just that his greatness and apparent promise should form so moving a contrast to his inexorable fate. That he, with " such splendid purpose in his eyes," with his love and suffering and hope, should be " blown about the desert dust, or sealed within the iron hills," has always been a fruitful and impressively pathetic theme. But art and religion appeal to disparate interests. If the Gospel is false, the aesthetic view of human life may be true, and the Christian hope has nothing in it. But if Christ is real, the only question worth asking is how far into the future His influence stretches. Can we suppose a line where it stops ?

Not only so ; but were the hope of blessedness to come

extinguished, present religious experience would part with its specific quality. The Christian attitude to doubt, to sense, to sin—whether in self or in society—would be radically altered. Suffering must lose its old relative aspect and become wholly dark if there is no prospect of a life unsorrowing, but only the assurance that pain and we shall disappear together. Fellowship with God, known to be merely for a term of years, is not the fellowship which Jesus gives. It is simple lack of imagination which denies this—failure to see that the future, when it arrives, will be as real as the present.

Thus the endless hope is no vestigial survival of Jewish apocalyptic. It is the result of seeing God in the grace of Jesus. There was a promise in the human heart which God fulfilled by giving Christ; there is now a promise in the Christian heart which He will fulfil by bringing in complete redemption—a promise not simply that Christ will continue to save men in this world, but that at last He will make an end of all tragedy. A page back I quoted words from Schleiermacher's earlier period. There is a later picture of the great thinker, in his sixty-third year, at the graveside of his only son. "I stand here," he then said, "with my comfort and hope set only on the strong petition of our Lord: 'Father, I will that they whom Thou hast given Me be with Me where I am.'" The Gospel, without the life everlasting, has lost its identity; and a man need only be a Christian long enough to know that this is a position beyond dispute. As it has been put, "The end is not always present to the religious consciousness; it lies sometimes below the horizon; but it is always there." Even the eighteenth-century Rationalism, which swept out most doctrines, kept its hold firmly on immortality, because in its dim, unimpassioned way it still clung fast to God.

Again, it has been objected that Christian eschatology

must of necessity be in conflict with science. It implies (does it not ?) that the present world-process will come to an abrupt termination, whereas the scientific mind can only conceive the series of changes in space and time—with which human life is inextricably entangled—as alike unending and unbeginning ; just as each effect must have a cause, and so backwards for ever, so each cause must have an effect, and so onwards without conclusion.[1]

It is not desirable to evade this by protesting simply that faith makes no assertions about the physical cosmos. That is not the fact. Faith is convinced, for example, that body is organic and ministrant to spirit ; that evolution was so guided of God as finally to issue in souls capable of Divine sonship ; that the phenomenon of death has no power to touch the higher self. These are all affirmations regarding the material system, its powers and its limitations ; and it is faith that makes them, not science.

But it may be pointed out that the prediction of an unending human history is at variance even with the hypothesis suggested by astronomy, according to which our planet will one day be uninhabitable. Mankind will be blotted off the face of the universe. If faith declares—validly, we Christians hold—that fellowship with God is not broken by the death of the individual, it is equally within its rights in urging that the reality of the future Kingdom is not affected by the coming annihilation of the race. The physical extinction of the species, if it happens, will make no difference to the things which God has prepared for them that love Him. Nothing that science can say vetoes Christian belief in the immortality of the individual. To believe in immortality, it is unnecessary to know the later fortunes of the body, for no ascertainable fact regarding physical corruption is rele-

[1] Cf. Kölbing, *Die bleibende Bedeutung der urchristlichen Eschatologie*, 30.

vant to the higher issue. In like manner, the final history of our planet is irrelevant to the Christian hope for mankind. The new transcendent order belongs to another plane of being. God will give the new environment as it may please Him. How or when reality will be vouchsafed to the perfect Kingdom—after the disappearance of the earth or before—we have no interest in deciding, even if decision were possible, for Christian hope is set not upon a future condition of the world, but on God.

Again, eschatology is assailed on moral grounds. "Otherworldliness," it is said, has commonly induced a contemptible neglect of life in the present—its ennobling activities, its pathetic needs. To live with a future life in sight means the undervaluation of civilized existence. We are called to possess the world and our own personality, to master nature's secrets, to give free play to intellect and imagination, to produce a society organised in wisdom and liberty. This task cannot be achieved by men whose energy and interest are distracted by thoughts of a coming world.

No one will deny that too often a selfish and fanatical "otherworldliness" has defaced the religious life. But any single interest may absorb the mind unduly. The man of science may be so engrossed in research as to neglect his family; the lover of sport may postpone civic duty to pleasure; have then sport and science no place in the good life? Such eccentricities may be put aside. The really important thing is that profoundly eschatological religion has so frequently supplied moral power and zest to great social reformers. It was Christians of this type who persuaded Great Britain to stamp out slavery. Faith of the same kind led to the amelioration of prisons and the establishment of hospitals. The consciousness of being in communion with God, such that even death could not touch it, had much to do with the manhood, trust and courage by

which these men were inspired.[1] If the human mind works sanely, what else could we expect? Can the man without hope work on as bravely or unweariedly as the man whose hope is limitless? Tholuck surely had psychology on his side when he said that only a Christian can live wholly in the present, for to him the past is pardoned and the future safe in God. What is more, no one is so constantly reminded as the Christian, if he will but study Jesus' words, that future destiny is in very close relation to present life and character. It is not believers in Christ who are tempted to exclaim, "Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die." It is not they whose moral energy is sapped by the refined and exquisite melancholy of the creed, "I came like Water, and like Wind I go."

To accuse present-day Christians of being too "other-worldly" is, however, fitted rather to provoke a smile. Far from thinking too often about the next life, they think much too seldom. It is certain that when spiritual zeal rekindles, as assuredly it will, we shall witness the uprush of a more vivid, august and passionate interest in the world to come. All deep feeling for God reopens that fountain of undying hope. It is the man who has received most through Christ who is surest that so far he has not received the best. Love, action, knowledge—the most desirable and worthy experiences given to man—all are ours, in this world, only in part and insecurely, whilst also it is certain that their perfect reality is in His keeping Who has bestowed the "earnest." And for the believer this means two things. On the one

[1] "The essential note of the Clapham Sect was philanthropy. Justification by works was the central doctrine of its adherents; but they were before and above all things the party of good works. Sharp, Clarkson, Wilberforce, and, later, Shaftesbury, were men of whom any Church might be proud. The abolition of the slave trade and of slavery, missions, Sunday schools, education, the Factory Acts—this was the field on which their activity displayed itself; they 'went about doing good'" (Fawkes, *Studies in Modernism*, 426).

hand, as that world of perfect good becomes more visible to faith and more attractive, " his grasp of this world becomes, perhaps, not less kindly, but it becomes less tenacious."[1] And on the other, how shall he prepare himself to possess that better, richer life, coming to flood our earthly experience as the ocean fills the shrunken river mouth with its mightier flood, except as he is true and faithful here ? For the content of Christian hope is morally qualified and is assimilated only in moral ways.

One point is perhaps worth adding. It is part of faith in God to believe that men will never cease to cherish the hope of immortality. Undoubtedly no proof can be given that the Church might not drop " the life everlasting " out of the creed. But faith is sure she will not, and the certainty reposes upon the unconditionally ethical character which belongs both to God and man as revealed in Jesus. Every renascence of spiritual religion, with its quickened impression of the value and incomparable greatness of Christ, will evoke a new conviction that the soul possessed by God cannot perish.

Finally, objection has been raised on the ground that eschatological conceptions are thoroughly symbolic and, in that character, are incapable of conveying truth. The mere *fact* of symbolism is of course evident. Haering, indeed, has argued that conceptions of the world to come are necessarily symbolic, so to speak, to the second power. Symbolism here mounts, he says, to a higher point than elsewhere in religious assertion, " for the simple reason that in eschatology we speak of communion with God under other conditions of existence than those of the present, and have no words in which to describe it but those which are taken from present conditions."[2] All words expressive of higher experience betray a far-off sensuous origin ; they reflect the life of earth. They do not convey perfectly even the ideas

[1] Rainy, *Philippians*, 254. [2] *The Christian Faith* (E. T.), 855.

and feelings we now have. How then can they set forth adequately a future spiritual experience that will itself have altered ? And is not this destructive of their claim to truth ?

The answer to this will in the main be found in the consideration that if symbolism in thinking excludes truth, then human thought in all its aspects is radically unsound. Sabatier, in a captivating but unsatisfying treatment of the subject,[1] has attempted to differentiate science from religion in this respect, arguing that while religion is doomed to express the transcendent in phenomenal images whose scope is strictly limited by space and time, exact sciences operate with conceptions which may be taken as precise equivalents of the objects described. Religion, therefore, speaks in parables ; science employs notions that copy facts. This is not the place for a detailed epistemological discussion, but it may be mentioned that prominent men of science, like Mach, now maintain that the fundamental ideas of physics, such as atom, molecule, energy, mass and ether, are symbolic through and through ; they are labour-saving devices, possessed of a high degree of mental utility, which yet may have no positively true relation to the objective facts of nature. If this be so, it is conceivable that the proportion of symbolism in a statement like " God is our Father " may be much lower than in many a proposition of physics, while in the words " God is love " it would, so far as I can see, have reached a vanishing point.

Apart from this, however, we have no cause to hide the fact that eschatological expressions are symbolic in a degree that is, within theology, special and abnormal. Admittedly robes and palms and songs, pearl gateways and crystal rivers cannot be taken in a literal sense, nor can such a text as " I will give to him to sit down with Me on My throne." Is this the equivalent of saying that no true state-

[1] *Esquisse d'une philosophie de la religion*, 390–400.

ment regarding the future can be made ? By no means. To begin with a fact easily overlooked, symbols not often merely but always have a quite definite meaning. Each symbol is a soul in a body. When it is remarked of a distinguished public man that he wore his laurels with becoming modesty, or of a thief that he showed his pursuers a clean pair of heels, the use of highly figurative language in no way excludes an entirely plain sense. Such phrases, it is true, do not give an exact photograph of the event, none the less they are understood by every person familiar generally with the matters in question. This existence, within the symbol, of a distinct thought is signalised very clearly by the fact that symbols undergo a perpetual process of criticism and refinement. The mind can criticise symbols because it has made them for its own ends ; it knows what they are trying to say, and, as thought advances, discovers how it may be better said. For us this means that in their faith Christian believers possess the key to unlock symbols which to others are dark and non-significant. Communion with God has rendered them familiar with what logicians call " the subject of discourse," enabling them to test the validity of figures by reference to the supreme reality of which all are partial expressions. So that even when what is not of this world is expressed in terms of this world, we are not without a guiding principle. And the task of Dogmatic, in this regard, is not to strip away the picture, but to be fully conscious of it, and, when it is outworn, to replace it by one more worthy.

We are thus entitled to use eschatological symbols freely, provided that our symbolism is in consonance with the Gospel. If we speak in faith, our words will have a valid sense, capable of verification by the best Christian feeling. It would not help us in the least to discard the loved ancient phrases, " In my Father's house are many mansions," or

"God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes," as being fatally metaphorical; on the contrary, we should lose inexpressibly by parting with expressions so natural and sincere. If we select a poem dealing with life beyond the veil, can we say it would gain *in truth* by the exclusion of all symbol? Take, for instance, Vaughan's well-known stanzas opening with these lines:

> "They are all gone into the world of light,
> And I alone sit lingering here."

Can it in this case be maintained that symbolism is a hindrance to the expression of truth, and not rather its choicest and most transparent medium? Who will venture to extract the substance of Vaughan's truth, and to exhibit it in more adequate form?

The question of symbolism, however, is suggestive of a graver difficulty. How shall we test doctrines of eschatology, proving them true or false? Is there an available criterion? It cannot of course be Bible language chosen indiscriminately. On this point the manifold character and content of Scripture eschatologies is conclusive, forming as it does a problem which the dogma of verbal inspiration could not in the least relieve. Conceptions of the last things found in the Synoptics diverge from those of St. Paul, St. Paul's from those of St. John. We need only consider what the New Testament affirms regarding the woes of the last time, the coming of Antichrist, his overthrow, the first resurrection and the second death, the millennial reign of Christ, to feel the utter hopelessness of erecting the Bible text into a final statutory code. To attempt to force upon modern intelligence the whole unsifted mass of Bible conceptions has the effect of bringing down the edifice of Christian hope in ruins. There are elements in the representation which have no power to evoke faith; nothing in the soul echoes to them; they are not felt to express any vital aspect of salva-

tion ; they are not made sure to the mind by the witness of the Spirit. Altogether apart from the Old Testament, as to which there will be no dispute, there are details even in the New Testament picture of things to come for which it is impossible any longer to win Christian interest. Can we assume, indeed, that St. Paul had finally adjusted his conclusions on each point ? And must we not allow for idiosyncrasy in the apostolic mind ? We surely must : and surely we may also hold that even an apostle may be a poet, who would stare at the literalism of the commentator. It will not do to proceed on an *a priori* view which puts the creative message of the Gospel on one level with any and every inherited conception of Rabbinism or apocalyptic.

Yet there is a criterion, and it may be formulated quite simply. It is the criterion we use in doctrine elsewhere ; and it is good for eschatology as for truth about Divine providence, or sin, or atonement. It is the Person of Jesus, in His sovereign redemptive power, as apprehended by the faith which finds God in Him. Belief concerning the last things, accordingly, is part of our confession of the Saviour. As we seek to distinguish husk and kernel in old tradition, we must again and again put the question, What truth, on this point or that, is certified to the soul by faith in Jesus ? What ideas are echoed in the redeemed spirit, winning free and unhesitating assent ? The question how we know a true eschatological statement when we see it can only be answered by reference to the same standard of truth as prevails in Christian Dogmatic as a whole—the Gospel in its vital unity with the believing mind. To elicit and to systematise the utterances of faith is our task. It is not postulates of practical Reason that we seek, or the speculative dicta of metaphysic, but the calm and triumphant certainties of the soul possessed by Christ.

H. R. Mackintosh.

THE IDENTITY OF THE "AMBROSIASTER": A FRESH SUGGESTION.

The name "Ambrosiaster" was invented by Erasmus to indicate the author of a Latin commentary on the thirteen Epistles of St. Paul, which has come down to us for the most part under the name of St. Ambrose. His rejection of Ambrosian authorship has been almost universally upheld by succeeding scholars, and a large number of guesses as to the real identity of the mysterious author have been put forward during the past four centuries. The bases for most of these were slender enough, and no names need be mentioned save Hilary the Luciferian deacon, Tyconius the Donatist [1] and Faustinus.[2] Each of these names was supported with some show of argument, but the problem was still unsolved when in 1899 the world-famous French Benedictine, Dom Germain Morin, O.S.B., of the Abbey, Maredsous, Belgium, pointed out a number of indications which seemed to him to favour the idea that one Isaac, a converted Jew concerned in the disturbances at the election of Pope Damasus, might have written the work. This view was made known to the readers of the Expositor in a graceful article by the Reverend A. E. Burn, entitled "The Ambrosiaster and Isaac the Converted Jew" (1899, vol. ii., 368–375). This opinion may be said to hold the field, as it has commanded the adhesion of Professors Theodor von Zahn, Joseph Wittig, and others. But in 1903 Dom Morin gave up his first suggestion in favour of a second, that the author was a distinguished proconsul of the day, Decimius Hilarianus Hilarius. Under the title "A New View about

[1] The view of the erudite patristic scholar, J. B. Morel, presbyter of Auxerre.

[2] The view of Prof. Joseph Langen, the Bonn Old Catholic.

Ambrosiaster" attention was called to this change of view by the present writer in the EXPOSITOR (1903, vol. i., pp. 442–455). The suggestion has claimed hardly any adherents.

Amidst this bewildering variety of opinion it might seem as if it were our duty to rest content with the certain knowledge that the work belongs to the last thirty years of the fourth century and to Italy. But it happens that it contains so many interesting statements, and is of such special excellence, that a knowledge of the author would be a real help in the assignment of its place among the historical documents belonging to its period. Moreover, the problem is not that of one work merely. For two others are now regarded, almost without a dissentient voice, as from the same pen, one the *Quaestiones Veteris et Novi Testamenti cxxvii.*, handed down to us under the name of Augustine,[1] and a fragment of a commentary on St. Matthew, preserved in the same manuscript as contains the "Muratorian Canon," and edited by Mercati and Turner.[2] The real importance of the three works is now gradually coming to be recognised, since Harnack wrote of the author: "We ought to call him the great unknown; for what Western expositor of the early period or the Middle Ages is his equal?" "Both works [the Commentary and the Quaestiones] are admirable in their kind, and perhaps the most distinguished product of the Latin Church in the period between Cyprian and Jerome." Jülicher is no less hearty in his admiration: "His exposition of the letters of Paul is not only important by reason of many

[1] Critically edited by the present writer in the Vienna *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*, vol. 50 (1908).

[2] The present writer assigned it to Ambrosiaster, and is followed by Zahn, Morin, etc. The fragment is edited in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, vol. v. (1903–04), pp. 218–241, and my argument is published in the same volume, pp. 608–621.

interesting notes on the history of dogma, morals and government, but is also the best written prior to the sixteenth century."

Such opinions constitute an ample reason for continuing to grapple with this difficult problem. Dom Morin amidst much research into other topics has found time to ponder further on it since 1903, and has published the result of his meditations in the *Revue Bénédictine* for January, 1914, in an article entitled, "Qui est l'Ambrosiaster? Solution Nouvelle." His two previous proposals were put forward merely as suggestions: the new view is presented as a certainty. It is right that it should be expounded in the pages of the EXPOSITOR, and some justification for the action of the present writer in doing so may be found in the fact that his own study of the Ambrosiaster engaged nearly ten years of his life. It must, however, be understood that I am not expressing either agreement or disagreement on my own part with the view of Dom Morin. Those who have taken the trouble to read what I have published on the subject will understand why. I am here as a reporter, anxious to extend to the wider world represented by the EXPOSITOR knowledge which might otherwise be confined to the readers of the *Revue Bénédictine*, who are not nearly as numerous as they ought to be.

The person fixed on by Dom Morin is Evagrius of Antioch, who died a little after 392 as bishop of the Eustathians in that city. It will be best to begin by stating what is known of this man's career, and then comparing what can be inferred from the works of the Ambrosiaster as to *his* career. Then one can compare the language of the one work which bears Evagrius' name, the translation of St. Athanasius' Life of St. Anthony, with the works of Ambrosiaster.

Evagrius was descended from Pompeianus, surnamed the Frank, who in A.D. 272 distinguished himself in Aurelian's

war against Zenobia. The family was very popular in Antioch, and some of its representatives lived as far away as Egypt. It was Pompeianus' grandson probably, also named Pompeianus, who was the father of Evagrius, and a great friend of the distinguished rhetorician Libanius. We hear nothing of Evagrius between his birth at Antioch and his first appearance in public life in the year 363. In that year the prefect Sallustius procured him official employment, and in the following year he obtained a higher position. His administration was distinguished by its purity, and he made no attempt to enrich himself, though married and the father of two children. Yet he was prosecuted for an error committed during his period of office, and it required the intervention of his powerful friends, Libanius, Sallustius and Rufinus, to secure his acquittal. In spite of this the Emperor Valentinian inflicted on him an enormous fine, which would have reduced him to beggary, but for the renewed support of his powerful friends.

It seems that this second higher position was in Italy, perhaps at Milan, where the imperial court was at the time. We know in any case that Evagrius came West with St Eusebius of Vercelli in 363 or 364 and did not return to the East till towards the autumn of 373. By this time he was already a priest. During this ten years' residence in Italy he supported the claims of Pope Damasus and exerted himself in opposition to the Arian bishop of Milan, Auxentius.

Returning to the East towards the end of 373, he passed by Caesarea in Cappadocia, and had an interview with St. Basil on the subject of the schism in the Church of Antioch. Evagrius had promised Basil to support Meletius, but joined the party of Paulinus. It was about this period that Evagrius and Jerome were intimate. Evagrius submitted his compositions to Jerome, and Jerome found in him a sympathetic

spirit. Besides sharing the tastes of Jerome, Evagrius had the acquirement, rare among the Oriental clergy, of a speaking and writing knowledge of Latin. His long period of residence in the West had made him almost a Latin, and it is highly probable that the priest Evagrius mentioned in the Acts of the Council of Aquileia of 381 is our Evagrius.

This varied career ended by the election of Evagrius as bishop in succession to Paulinus of Antioch in 388 or 389. The bishops of the West, Ambrose among them, refrained from taking a side in the rivalry between him and Flavian, and made a vain attempt to put an end to this troublesome situation at the council of Capua in 391. The death of Evagrius a year or two after the beginning of his episcopate solved the difficulty.

In the first and fifth chapters of my *Study of Ambrosiaster*[1] I endeavoured to come to some conclusions regarding the life and career of that author from the internal evidence of his writings. It is curious to see how well these correspond with the sketch just given of the life and experiences of Evagrius. "It seems clear that the writer was of high birth" (p. 177). "The references to Egypt are rather frequent" (p. 35). "The author had some connexion with or special interest in Egypt" (p. 36). A "large number of his illustrations are derived from Government and Law" (p. 23). "The references to Law in general or to particular statutes are unusually frequent" (p. 27). "He draws many illustrations from the emperor, the highest state officials, and the senatorial order. He has a keen sense of what it is fitting for them to do. He has a respect for dignities and class distinctions, such as aristocrats and their servants alone have. He knows exactly the duties of all officials . . . he himself was a senator and a high official in the state" (p. 177). "References in both works seem to point to the fact that he had

[1] Cambridge, 1905 (*Texts and Studies*, vii. 4).

also held high administrative posts. . . . His legal terminology is not highly technical in character, but exactly such as an experienced administrator would employ" (p. 178). "There are indications that he had travelled much" (p. 179). The author mentions Eusebius (of Vercelli) in complimentary terms in *quaest.* cxxv.

Almost more striking is the curious relation of Ambrosiaster to the clergy. Most of his work shows a position of detachment from them. The greater part of his writings seems the product of a layman keenly interested in the Bible and in theology. But this characteristic is hard to reconcile with passages which suggest after all some ecclesiastical position. From *Quaestio CI.*, "On the Boastfulness of the Roman Deacons," it may be justly argued that the author was neither bishop nor deacon, but possibly a presbyter. From some of the concluding *Quaestiones*, which on other grounds may be safely assigned to a later period of the author's literary activity, the natural inference is that the author was a bishop.

Ambrosiaster, like Evagrius, was also a declared supporter of Damasus,[1] and a combatant of the Arians.

The great interest in the Jews shown by Ambrosiaster is somewhat of a difficulty in the way of identifying the two. Evagrius was not a Jew. It occurs to me that his wife may have been. But in any case the difficulty is not crucial. Both Professor Cumont and Professor Brewer have declared their conviction that Ambrosiaster was pagan by origin.[3] To this double testimony may be added the evidence of a Hebrew scholar like Professor G. Buchanan Gray that there is no trace of Hebrew origin in the *Quaestiones*.[4] Ambrosiaster's interest in the Jews is only more

[1] *Study*, p. 166. [2] *Study*, p. 38: Morin, p. 26.
[3] Cf. Morin, p. 27, and notes.
[4] *Mansfield College Magazine* for 1908–1909.

pronounced than his interest in many other races, and is due to his cast of mind and his experience as administrator.

Hostility to the Greeks as authorities for the Biblical text seems strange if the author were Greek by birth, but he seems to have imbibed his Biblical learning in Latin centres, probably in North Italy. There is something of Antioch in his method of exegesis, and Jerome also often criticises the Greek authorities unfavourably. Professor E. W. Watson is entitled to the credit of his suggestion that Ambrosiaster was a foreigner, in other words a Greek, by birth.[1]

The foregoing discussion lends fresh interest to Jerome's notice of Evagrius in his *De Viris Inlustribus* (A.D. 392). He is described thus :—"Evagrius, bishop of Antioch, a man of keen and exceptional intellect, while still a presbyter, read to me papers on various subjects, which he has not yet published : he has also translated the Life of St. Anthony from the Greek of Athanasius into our language." The papers on various subjects (*diuersarum ὑποθέσεων tractatus*) correspond perfectly with the *Quaestiones* and the commentaries, the latter of which are called *tractatus* in the manuscripts. Again, I was led to conjecture that the second edition of the *Quaestiones* at least was published by some one else after the death of the author.[2] It is quite clear that nos. CI. and CVIIII. were first issued apart and anonymously.

The relation of Jerome to the Ambrosiaster writings might well be the subject of a special monograph. I pointed out that Pope Damasus must have had *Quaestiones VI., IX., X., XII., XI.* on Genesis before his eyes, when about 384 he addressed them to Jerome (cf. his Epistle 35), but Jerome knows nothing of them. From letter 73 (398 A.D.) of Jerome we learn that *Quaestio CVIIII.* had been sent to him by Evangelus as a separate anonymous work. Epistle 146,

[1] *Classical Review*, xxiii. 237. [2] *Study*, p. 11.

addressed to the same Evangelus, shows clear dependence on *Quaestio CI.*[1] If Jerome was acquainted with the real author of these documents, we could explain his silence by that author's resort to schism.

Let me now select some of the most striking linguistic parallels, which Dom Morin has accumulated, between Evagrius' translation of Athanasius' *Life of St. Anthony* and the writings of Ambrosiaster. The references to the sections of the *Life of St. Anthony* precede the others in each case.

Prologue, *uestrae caritatis* imperium : in the Greek simply τὸ παρ' ὑμῶν ἐπίταγμα, cf. the beginning of *Q.* ci., dum iussis *caritatis* parere uolumus.

Prol., ut plenius aliquid *addiscens* : *addisco* = disco, favourite of Ambrst.

6 *multimoda* . . . arma : nothing in the Greek corresponding to the adj. *multimodus*. Cf. *Q.* xxxiii., 7 *multimodam* rationem habent uerba.

7. *supra memorati* doctoris : no equivalent to *supra memoratus* in the Greek, a favourite expression of Ambrst.

9. *serpens sibilum* personabat : no word of *sibilus* in the Greek : cf. *sibilum serpentum*, *Q.* lx. 5.

20. *fons et origo*, also by the translator (so also 35), occurs *Q.* p. 376, 3.

49. *ea exigor* : *Q.* p. 134, 11 saluator . . . *exigendus* utique non erat.

59. *incongruus* with a dative : *Q.* pp. 267, 21, 300, 8.

65. *gemitu ac lamentatione* : this corresponds to two participles in the Greek, but compare *Q.* p. 397, 1 *lamentatione et gemitu*, p. 217, 24 *lamentationibus et gemitibus*.

69. *verbum dei deus* : with this expression, due to the translator, compare *Q.* p. 367, 21, *uerbum dei deus* est. (But compare also Ambr. *expos. in ps. cxviii.* 11, 5, 1).

75. *ministris auibus* : *Comm.* p. 468 B *ministra* nube, etc.

[1] *Study*, pp. 170 f.

79. *illud autem quale est quod*: so *Q.* p. 308, 18.

80. *deuotus deo*: so *Q.* pp. 210, 9, 223, 10, 364, 14.

82. *cum adsumptione palmarum, quod idololatriae apud Alexandriam insigne est*: an interpolation of the translator, showing special acquaintance with Alexandrian usage, cf. *Study*, pp. 37 f.

93. *Italiae, Illyrico*: these two countries are added by the translator as other places where St. Anthony's name was known. Such knowledge is eminently characteristic of the far-travelled Ambrosiaster.

Ipsi etiam, *quae urbium caput est, Romae*: the Greek has simply εἰς τὴν Ῥώμην. But such a superfluous addition is quite in the manner of Ambst.: cf. *Q.* p. 195, 13 *urbis Romae, quae caput esse* uidetur omnium ciuitatum.

This is only a small selection from the long list of parallels given by Dom Morin. He is at the same time careful to point out that on the one hand the words *numquidnam* and *ethnicus* are found in the translator and absent from Ambrosiaster, while on the other hand *ac per hoc* and *hinc est unde*, both so characteristic of Ambrosiaster, are absent from the translation. But these facts need cause no difficulty. The translation is after all a translation and not an original work, and it is also a more careful composition than the other works, as it received the final polish of its author and was issued under his own name. Dom Morin sees traces of Jerome's revising hand in it.

A difficulty not mentioned by Dom Morin is to be found in the fact that there is no trace in the Ambrosiaster writings of any interest in monasticism. In this fact I long ago remarked a divergence from his great contemporaries Jerome, Ambrose, Augustine. But it cannot be denied that Dom Morin has furnished us with a powerful argument in favour of the identification of the mysterious Ambrosiaster and the schismatic bishop of Antioch, Evagrius, translator of Athanasius' *Life of St. Anthony*. ALEX. SOUTER.

NOTES ON THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

III. The Call of the First Disciples (i. 35–51).

In this narrative two questions present themselves for answer. (1) It is usually assumed that John, the son of Zebedee, was one of the two disciples of the Baptist who left him for Jesus, and that as Andrew found first (πρῶτον) his own brother Simon, so John next found his brother James, and thus the two pairs of brothers were the earliest disciples of Jesus. It is true that John, the son of Zebedee, is closely associated with Peter in the records of the ministry; but it does not necessarily follow that he was one of the two who first came to Jesus; and it is also mere conjecture that James as well was brought to discipleship at this time. If the unnamed disciple was the son of Zebedee, the fact would be one reason for assigning to him the authorship of the Gospel. If this identification is challenged, however, the question remains, Was the evangelist the unnamed disciple? The grounds on which I am inclined to answer the question affirmatively are: (*a*) the tokens of an eye-witness which the narrative offers in its minute and vivid detail; and (*b*) the probability that the evangelist (except in a few passages to be afterwards noted) confined his narrative to first-hand reports of what he had himself passed through.

(2) While the narrative bears the tokens of an eyewitness, it must be admitted that the reminiscences are coloured by reflexions in two respects. (*a*) First of all the evangelist assigns to these first disciples a much more definite confession of Jesus' Messiahship (verses 41, 45, 49) than in view of the Synoptic representation is at all probable. If Jesus welcomed Peter's confession of His Messiahship at Cæsarea Philippi as a revelation, not of flesh and blood, but of the

Father (Matt. xvi. 17) is it at all likely that such a confession would be made by any of the disciples at the very beginning of their contact with Jesus? Even if in His intercourse James was less reserved than He found it needful to be afterwards, it is not at all likely that so definite a conception was given to the first disciples. In recollecting the past, it is impossible to exclude the influence of later experiences, or of our reflexions upon them; and we must admit that the evangelist here represents Jesus as already being to His disciples what only at a much later stage of their life and thought He became to them. We may raise the question also whether the words to Peter in verse 42 are not antedated, and must be assigned to a time when Jesus had gained a more intimate knowledge of the character of His disciples.

(*b*) This verse and verse 48 also illustrate the tendency of the evangelist to exaggerate the supernatural character of Jesus' knowledge. That Jesus had an exceptional foresight, based on insight regarding those with whom He came into contact, the Synoptists also testify; but it is evident that the evangelist in verse 48 is thinking of something altogether miraculous. That Jesus may actually have seen Nathanael with the bodily eye as he was engaged in his devotions under the fig-tree need not be questioned. How did He in that moment gain the knowledge of Nathanael's inner life, the commendation of him implies? One cannot exclude the possibility of a supernatural intuition given to Jesus in the case of Peter as well as Nathanael, and to this explanation I was inclined in my *Studies in the Inner Life of Jesus* (pp. 151–2); but we must also admit the probability that the evangelist's history has here been influenced by his theology. Some indications of insight of an exceptional kind must have been given, and would have excited wonder and stimulated faith; for that seems implied in the saying

of verse 51. The use of the term Son of Man and the reference to Jacob's dream at Bethel in that utterance make it highly probable that we have here a genuine logion of Jesus ; and its contents need not raise any doubt. Jesus based His insight into man, as all His other gifts, on His relation as Son to Father ; and what He here promised the disciples was that in His companionship they should witness a constant and intimate communion of God and man.

IV. The Marriage at Cana of Galilee (ii. 1–12).

In this story three matters call for notice. (1) As we find that in the rest of the Gospel the evangelist confines himself almost entirely to Jesus' work in Judæa and Jerusalem ; and the simplest explanation of that fact is that he was a Judæan disciple, who did not at least usually accompany Jesus in Galilee, we may raise the question, whether he was himself present at the marriage feast ? If he were not here an eye-witness, we might conjecture that he had got an inaccurate report of the actual occurrence, and that would relieve the difficulty about the nature of the miracle, to which we must return ; it might be conjectured to be a natural provision misunderstood. As the mother of Jesus was entrusted to the care of the beloved disciple (xix. 26, 27), she might be supposed to be his informant, especially as the incident had a poignant personal interest for her (verse 4). It is more probable, however, that the evangelist did on this journey accompany Jesus, as he would not be inclined so soon after the first interview to depart from Him.

(2) We must accordingly face the difficulty of the nature of the miracle. I am a firm believer in the supernatural endowment in knowledge and power of Jesus, and His miraculous activity ; but I must admit that this miracle, as well as that of the feeding of the five thousand (of which the story of the feeding of the four thousand is probably only a

variant tradition) presents a greater difficulty than the healing works or even the stilling of the storm and the walking on the sea ; one cannot conceive the process by which loaves and fish were multiplied, or water was transformed into wine. The explanation of accelerated natural process, poetically expressed in the hymn,

> 'Twas springtide when He blest the bread,
> And harvest when He brake,

does not afford adequate relief to the mind. Probably we must be content to say that the Inconceivable to us need not be impossible. As we are here concerned primarily with the Fourth Gospel, it may be added, however, that the difficulty here is of the same kind, not more, and perhaps even less than in the miracle of the feeding of the five thousand, which all the Synoptists record ; so that in this respect the Fourth Gospel does not appear less trustworthy than the others.

(3) As the miracle is sometimes treated as symbolic of the transformation of human life by the influence of Christ, and its reality is even denied on the ground that it is a misunderstood allegory, it may be noted that in the narrative itself there is no hint that the evangelist himself so regarded it. If he had, would he not, as he has not hesitated to do in other cases, have added reflexions to reminiscences to fulfil this intention ? Surely we need not go beyond verse 11 for his interest in the event. We need not turn aside from our main purpose to defend the character of Jesus against the charge suggested by the jest of the ruler of the feast (verse 10).

V. The Visit to Jerusalem (ii. 13–25).

(1) This narrative at once confronts us with one of the most formidable objections to the historicity of the Gospel. It records a number of visits to Jerusalem at the time of the

feasts, whereas the Synoptists record only the last visit, and confine the ministry to Galilee and the surrounding regions. Does this difference justify our dismissing the Fourth Gospel as unhistorical ? Some reasons in arrest of any such hasty judgment may, however, be given.

(*a*) The completeness of the Synoptic record is an assumption which the results of modern scholarship are more and more disproving. According to the Two-Document hypothesis, the main sources of the Synoptists are two. Mark's reports of Peter's reminiscences, and the collection of sayings of Jesus. In his recent book on *Gospel Origins,* Professor Holdsworth gives this hypothesis a form which at least challenges close scrutiny and respectful consideration. He maintains that Mark himself prepared three editions of his own work, so accounting for some of the differences of Matthew and Luke from Mark, and from one another ; and that it was Matthew who first arranged a mere collection of detached sayings of Jesus in a series of discourses, which he fitted into a Markan framework. This statement of the hypothesis is mentioned to throw into bolder relief the fact that the Synoptists cannot be regarded as giving an exhaustive account of the ministry of Jesus. While Luke had access to another source dealing with a ministry in Perea on the way to Jerusalem for the last visit, and may have gleaned a few additional facts on his visit with Paul to Jerusalem (Acts xxi. 15), yet for the record of events Peter is the only eyewitness. His interest as a Galilean was in the ministry in Galilee. His silence about his first meeting with Jesus, as recorded in John i. 41, 42, is certainly difficult to explain. One would have thought that the story would often be upon his lips ; but is not a possible explanation this, that after a short period of intercourse Peter and Andrew returned to their homes and their callings, until Jesus transferred His ministry for reasons to be immedi-

ately noted from Judæa to Galilee ; and that he regarded his discipleship as beginning with the call to constant companionship in the Galilean ministry, and so made no mention of the previous less intimate and constant relation ? It is extraordinary that there is no mention of Peter's presence with Jesus in Jerusalem at any of the feasts except the last, although in the sixth chapter, when the scene of the ministry is shifted to Galilee, he is mentioned. We have no evidence that all the twelve went with Jesus on all these visits to Jerusalem. The organisation was probably less formal and fixed than later ecclesiastical associations lead us to regard it as being. And it may have existed primarily for the work in Galilee, as all the twelve except Judas were Galileans. Peter may, therefore, have said nothing about the visits to Jerusalem as he had nothing to report as an eyewitness. For it is certain that in his discourses nothing was further from his mind than to furnish a complete biography of Jesus. I may throw out a suggestion which has occurred to me, but which would require further testing before it could be urged with any confidence. May not Mark have first heard Peter give an account of the Galilean ministry for the instruction of the primitive community in Jerusalem, for whom any report of visits in Jerusalem would be unnecessary, even if he had been able to speak with special knowledge ? This local circumstance may have given its form to the Petrine tradition of the life and work of Jesus. The account of the last visit would be added when Peter went on his missionary travels ; and the present form of the Gospel according to Mark would be determined by the needs of the readers to whom it was addressed. Is it not highly probable that Peter's teaching in Jerusalem would include the account of the Galilean ministry ? We must always remind ourselves that our ignorance is much greater than our knowledge of the life and work of Jesus ; and there is room for conjec-

ture which accords and does not conflict with the evidence we have.

(*b*) If the Synoptic records are incomplete, we may welcome an additional source of information, if its authenticity can be maintained on historical grounds. Is it not only probable, but even certain that Jesus as the Messiah of the Jewish nation could not be content to offer Himself for its acceptance or rejection in the comparatively insignificant province of Galilee, but must have felt constrained to press His claims upon it at the very centre of its national religious life at the seasons when Jews from all parts of the world had come together to worship ? More than London is to the British Empire was Jerusalem to the Jewish nation ; it had a sanctity such as Rome has perhaps for the Roman Catholic, if not even greater. Could the full responsibility of refusing His claims be cast on the nation, if the full opportunity for considering these claims had not been given ?

But the Synoptic record of the last visit to Jerusalem presupposes a previous ministry there. The mere reports of His sayings and doings in Galilee would not have affected the priests and scribes and the populace in Jerusalem, as the story witnesses. Surely the lament over Jerusalem (Matt. xxiii. 37–39) would become unreal rhetoric if Jesus had not made a more persistent and passionate endeavour to overcome unbelief and hate than the Synoptists record. How could He have said, " How often would I have gathered thy children, and ye would not ! " if He only at the end of His ministry made such an attempt ?

Other evidence may be mentioned. Luke records the visit of Jesus to the home of Martha and Mary (Luke x. 38–42), and there is no good ground for suspecting John's statement that it was in Bethany. Had this been a first visit to former strangers, would such a conversation be credible ? Jesus had adherents near Jerusalem before the last visit.

The same fact is proved by the arrangements Jesus made both for the use of the ass for His entry and of the upper room for the supper (Matt. xxi. 2, 3 ; Mark xiv. 13, 14). In neither case need we suppose supernatural knowledge on the part of Jesus, but a preconcerted sign with devoted disciples, ready to put their possessions at the Master's disposal. There was a Judæan as well as a Galilean circle of disciples, and these, and not the twelve, may be referred to in some passages in the Fourth Gospel.

(*c*) This fact also suggests the answer to a question which may be raised regarding the beloved disciple, or the evangelist. It is usually taken for granted that he must be sought for among the twelve ; and with this assumption Westcott starts in seeking to prove that the son of Zebedee must be, and could alone be, the author of the Gospel. If one so appreciative of and devoted to Jesus as Mary of Bethany was not one of the women following Him and ministering to Him, but remained in her home in Bethany ; if one or more disciples in Jerusalem not only were ready to offer ass or room for the Master's use, but seem even to have been unknown to the Galilean disciples who were sent on the errand, is it impossible that the " beloved disciple," who could receive and retain the deeper teaching of the Master, after a short period of following Jesus, even in Galilee, returned to his home in Jerusalem, but was afterwards with Him only when He renewed His " forlorn hope " to win the city to Himself from its doom ? We have evidence in the Synoptists that Jesus after the confession at Cæsarea Philippi failed to find in His constant companions the responsive sympathy with His teaching about His death that He sought. These quarrels about precedence in the kingdom show how far their minds were from His. It was John, the son of Zebedee, who joined in the request for the nearest places to the throne in the kingdom (Matt. xx. 20–28). It was He

too who wanted to call down fire on the Samaritan village (Luke ix. 54). It will not do to say that it was the grace of God which changed the son of Boanerges into the apostle of love; for the capacity to receive and retain His deeper teaching must seem credible in this disciple as he was at the time of the ministry, not as he might afterwards become. We may conclude then that the beloved disciple was with Jesus in Jerusalem, but did not usually follow Him in Galilee. In Galilee a public movement was possible which would have been at once suppressed in Jerusalem; and so probably the Judæan disciples were doing secretly a work for the Master, which showed their devotion, and tested their courage not less, but even more than the open following of Jesus in his Galilean ministry. The reason why Jesus went up only at the feasts was probably that the presence of the Galilean pilgrims in the city and its environs did offer Him a measure of protection which at other times would have been denied Him (see Mark xiv. 2, "Not during the feast, lest haply there shall be a tumult of the people").

(2) The record of the cleansing of the temple in the Fourth Gospel at the beginning of the ministry also raises a difficulty, as a similar action is recorded in the Synoptists at the end. But the difficulty is not insuperable. The quotation in verse 17 suggests that it was in the mood of prophetic inspiration, in "holy enthusiasm," under the influence of the Spirit manifested at His baptism, which in Mark's vivid phrase, "driveth Him into the wilderness" (i. 12), and sustained Him there through His long fast, that He performed this act. It was not an open claim of Messiahship, but such a challenge to the corrupt priesthood as any zealous reformer might have offered. The second cleansing, following on the entry into Jerusalem, was an assertion of His Messianic authority, not less but more significant because of the repetition. The claims He had made with growing frankness

and boldness on successive visits He confirmed by this act: the first cleansing was an appeal for reform; the second was a condemnation of resistance to that appeal. Notice the greater severity of the rebuke on the second than on the first occasion. "Make not my Father's house a house of merchandise" (verse 16) becomes "Ye have made it a den of robbers" (Mark xi. 17). What makes this difference the more significant is that the tone of the Fourth Gospel towards the Jews is usually more severe than that of the Synoptists. Imprudent the act was not, as it was necessary for Jesus to test the feelings of the Jewish rulers towards a reform movement, so that He might adapt the method of His ministry to the actual situation. There was zeal, but it was also according to knowledge.

(3) A third question arises in connexion with the interpretation of the sign by the evangelist (verses 19–22). Is it likely that Jesus at this stage in His ministry would already be anticipating His death and resurrection? And even if He did, would He refer to that in replying to the Jewish rulers? Significant as the resurrection was for the evangelist in later days, and inclined as he was both to antedate events and utterances, and to ascribe to Jesus a knowledge more supernatural than the historical evidence requires us to assume, it is natural that he should give the saying this meaning; but valuable as his reminiscences may be historically only a superseded view of inspiration can require us to regard his reflexions as infallible theologically. We may attempt an interpretation congruous to the situation. Jesus, confident of His vocation and endowment, challenges the priesthood to destroy the religion concentrated in the temple, and declares His ability to compensate for that loss by restoring the worship of God. We must add that it is just possible that Jesus, conceiving His vocation in terms of the prophecy of the suffering Servant, was Himself aware

that the conflict so begun with the Jewish rulers would have a tragic close, and yet was sure that the Father would secure to Him the final triumph. But it is not likely that this was the meaning He intended His utterance to convey.

(4) The twenty-fifth verse in the English translation appears another instance of the evangelist's tendency to ascribe to Jesus supernatural knowledge in an extreme form. It suggests, as we read it, that He was independent of information given to Him, and possessed all knowledge as a personal endowment; but it is to be noted that the verb used here is γινώσκειν, and not εἰδέναι. Unless the papyri give proof that the distinction of the words had been obliterated in the *Koine*, of which the articles of Drs. Moulton and Milligan in the EXPOSITOR give no indication, we may acquit the evangelist even of this suspicion. He represents the knowledge, not as intuitive, but as experimental; not as innate, but as acquired. It was by testing men, as He had in this act tested the rulers, that He came to know what was in man.

(5) A question does arise in connexion with the twenty-third verse. What were "the signs which Jesus did"? The Gospel has not recorded any miracles in Jerusalem at this point. Had they occurred, and did the evangelist omit the record because he could not attach any symbolic significance to them, nor find any other personal interest in them? Or is it unlikely that at so early a stage in the ministry Jesus would freely work miracles? And is it not possible that either verses 23 and 24 may be displaced, or, in view of the reference to signs in iii. 2, we must allow a considerable interval of time for a continuous ministry in Jerusalem between the cleansing of the temple and the widespread movement of untrustworthy belief to which these verses refer? It is not improbable that in the first inspiration which followed His baptism Jesus did use His super-

natural power more freely than He did afterwards, when the evident peril of His being treated as merely a wonder-worker inspired a restraint, which only urgent need and confident faith could overcome. Had the evangelist been possessed by the desire for miracle-mongering, he would assuredly not have been content with noting only the failure of the signs to produce the kind of faith which Jesus desired, and to which He could trust His person and His cause.

ALFRED E. GARVIE.

THE ETERNAL LOVE AND CHRISTIAN UNITY.

THERE is an utterance in our Lord's great High-priestly Prayer as given in the 17th Chapter of St. John's Gospel which has not received in general the attention it deserves. Indeed, it is only since the publication of the R.V. that the words referred to have been open to the ordinary Bible reader. But they are very important in themselves and in their bearing on the vital matter of Christian Unity. They occur in the 23rd verse, where Jesus, praying for the unity of believers, says: "that the world may know that thou didst send me, *and lovedst them, even as thou lovedst me.*" The words specially referred to are those in italics, which are rendered in the A.V., "and hast loved them, as thou hast loved me," which might be taken as denoting a love arising in time merely, and has been generally so taken. But ἠγάπησας is the Aorist, rightly rendered in R.V. as "lovedst," referring to action in past time. The difference from the A.V. might be still more plainly seen were we to render ἠγάπησας "didst love (them)" as ἀπέστειλας immediately preceding is rendered by R.V. "didst send (me)." The prayer also concludes with the words: "that the love wherewith thou lovedst me may

be in them," where again we have in A.V. the misleading "hast loved me," instead of "lovedst me."

The question which has sometimes been discussed, whether the English Perfect may not often best express the Greek Aorist, need not trouble us here. When in the 24th verse, where Jesus speaks of *His* being loved by the Father, the A.V. renders the word by "lovedst," and in the 23rd verse, where He refers to the love of the Father for His *disciples*, it is rendered "hast loved," the fact that the very same word is in the original used of the Father's love for Him and for His disciples is certainly concealed from the English reader. In any case the reference is to something in the past. It may be noted that the American Revisers in their final issue adhere to the E.R.V. rendering.

I.

Now, Jesus says that the love wherewith the Father loved Him was a love in Eternity—"before the foundation of the world" (verse 24), just as in verse 5 He speaks of "the glory which I had with thee before the world was." Therefore, when He prays in the 23rd verse, "that the world may know that thou didst send me, and lovedst them even as thou lovedst me," it is affirmed that believers in Christ were loved by God with the same love wherewith the Father loved Christ, which was a love, not merely in time, but in Eternity—"before the foundation of the world." The same conclusion follows from the prayer "that the love wherewith thou lovedst me may be in them, and I in them" (verse 26); for unless they were loved with the same Eternal love, how could that love be in them, or Christ be in them? If this be so, where can we find a higher, more inspiring and elevating truth? But it is the same thing as Paul teaches when in Colossians he says that *in Christ* were all things created—in Christ, "the Son

of His Love." If God *is* Love no other creative motive is conceivable than the Love that He is. But this Love must have an object. Paul says that the object of this Love was "the Son," in Whom *all* were created, and here it is said to have been Christ and also those who believed in Him, or were united to Him in faith and life. In His creative Vision God beheld, not one Son only, but "many sons" in whom He should rejoice, brought to Him through the manifestation of the one Son. As the Author of the Epistle to the Hebrews also says: "It became him, for whom are all things, and through whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the author of their salvation perfect through sufferings." Hence Jesus says here also: "the glory which thou hast given me I have given them; that they may be one even as we are one." This could not have been said unless their relation to God in sonship should be *essentially* the same as His own, while He remains "the first-born among many brethren," and was "the first-born of all Creation." That it was not merely after they believed that God loved them appears also from the statement: "thine they were, and thou gavest them to me." As Paul also says, we were chosen *in Christ* before the foundation of the world (Eph. i. 4).

Science cannot give us the least hint as to the motive or the ultimate purpose of the Creation which it studies. We cannot fail to ask ourselves what these can be. If we say that it was *man* that God had in view, a moment's reflection shows us that it cannot have been man as a race existing in time merely or on the earth. For whatever height man may here reach, not only must the individual, with all he may have gained of outward or inward possession, but the race itself, perish from off the earth. This earth cannot be the abode of life for ever, and even if it could, what of the myriads that have been and still are constantly

passing away from it ? How welcome, therefore, the revelation that what God had in view was man in the image of the eternal Sonship, that the motive of the creation was the Divine vision of those who should share in the life of Sonship towards Himself—a love for them—that the Divine purpose was to create sons and daughters to Himself, human children sharing in the Divine life, which is not of Time merely, but Eternal. We cannot by any possibility get beyond this ; there can be nothing higher. And there can be nothing more worthy as the creative purpose than the desire of the Divine Love to spread itself abroad and make finite beings sharers in the Divine Eternal Life. There can be no more satisfying conception of human Destiny. For the Divine Life is the all-perfect life of Love, above or beyond which thought cannot go. That this is God's thought for His children is farther apparent from the prayer " that they may be one even as we are one, I in them and thou in me, that they may be perfected into one." Such unity through Divine indwelling is only possible if the idea of human sonship is essentially Divine, as it was manifested in Christ.

If such was the object of the creation, how true are Paul's sayings, " All things are yours," and, " All things work together for good to them that love God " seen to be. The world exists for the fulfilment of God's purpose ; and if that purpose was founded in love for those who should be sons and daughters to Him, how surely must that purpose be fulfilled in their experience, however much may for the moment seem to be against it. Well might Paul ask, " If God be for us, who can be against us ? "

But if we have here a high purpose, it may be asked, Is it not also a narrow one ? Is it not in fact the old doctrine of eternal Divine Election that we are here brought back to ? Does not Jesus speak of giving Eternal Life to all whom the Father had " given " Him, " the men whom

thou gavest me out of the world: thine they were and thou gavest them to me," and does He not say, "I pray not for the world, but for those whom thou hast given me"? It is certainly election in the sense that those who had believed on Christ had been given to Him out of the world and had been loved by God before the world began. This is the truth in the doctrine which we cannot ignore but, rather, need to realize. But it will be observed that Jesus also prays that those as yet belonging to "the world" may be led to believe and to know that the Father had sent Him, in order that they also might be brought into the sacred circle; for "this is life eternal, that they should know thee the only true God, and Him whom thou didst send." The truth that removes all seeming narrowness is that the world itself was created *in Christ* as the Son, and all other sons seen in Him. Those whom the Father loved and gave to Christ were all who should through faith come to share in that life of sonship which was eternal in God and was to be manifested in its power in Jesus in the flesh. "As many as received Him to them gave he the right to become children of God, even to them that believe in his name, who were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God" (John i. 12). It was *thus* that the Father "gave them" to Christ. It was *in Christ* that He saw them and loved them. Only such could He love with the love of God. But the very purpose of the manifestation of His love in Christ and of His gift of men to Him was, we are told, that the *world* might believe and know the truth, and thus become of the number of those so loved from all eternity. The purpose of the Divine love was not anything that might be selfishly appropriated and rejoiced in by its recipients, but for the sake of the world—"that the world might believe." To this end was it that Jesus prayed that the same love should

dwell in and be manifested by His disciples—those who had already believed, or who should believe on Him through their word.

II.

Here we reach the bearing of this love on Christian Unity. The bringing of "the world" to faith and to God was to be reached through the manifested unity of Christians in that love which had been manifested in Christ, which was to be, not more highly but more extensively, manifested by His brethren. Therefore He prays, "that they may all be one; even as thou Father (art) in me, and I in thee, that they also may be in us: that the world may believe that thou didst send me. And the glory which thou hast given me I have given unto them; that they may be one, even as we (are) one. I in them, and thou in me, that they may be perfected into one; that the world may know that thou didst send me, and lovedst them, even as thou lovedst me" (vers. 21–23); and again, "that the love wherewith thou lovedst me may be in them, and I in them" (ver. 26). If Christ dwelt in His Church, wholly possessing it, there could not but be unity; for, as Paul said, "Christ is not divided." And it was *thus*, through the love wherewith the Father had loved them from all eternity being *in* them as the principle of their life that Christ Himself, the Son of that same Love, should be in them. It was their possession by and perfect oneness in that Love that should manifest God to the world so that it should believe and be saved. That love in them would be God in them, and when the world sees God manifested in the love that fills the Church, the world will believe in God and in His presence in Christ and His Church. God cannot be fully seen in one individual Christian, or in any number of Christians separated from each other and devoted more or less to other ends than the

service of Love, although something of God may be manifested by them. But just as when we see a physical body in all its parts acting harmoniously for one end, we know that all are possessed by a Life greater than enters any one of them, so, where a Body of men and women are united in a Love that transcends all thoughts of self, the presence of a Higher than themselves, even the Love that God is, is made evident. It is this unity in Love that is so greatly needed. Not a unity in doctrine or organisation, or in what we call Church-work merely, for this might very well exist without that deeper, Diviner unity for which Jesus prayed, and without that sole service of Love which manifests God. It is the unity of all disciples of Christ in that Divine Love which was the very source of their being and which was manifested in Christ, and in the sole service of the love that is the manifestation of God in man. As He had said before: "A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another; even as I have loved you, that ye also love one another. By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another" (chap. xiii. 34, 35); and again: "This is my commandments that ye love one another, even as I have loved you" (xv. 12, also verse 17). As Paul also describes the Church as "a body fitly framed and knit together" making "increase of the body unto the building up of itself in love" (Eph. iv. 16; cf. 1 Cor. xiii. 1–3, where he says though he had all else, but had not love, he was nothing). And as John in his 1st Epistle declares over and over again that Love is the one essential thing: "He that loveth not knoweth not God, for God is Love." It is in the first place love amongst Christians towards one another, love to be manifested in the Church, not in word only but "in deed and truth," but it is at the same time a Love which goes forth towards all men. For it is the very love that God is, which was

manifested in Christ—"that the love wherewith thou lovedst me may be in them, and I in them." For the want of this unity in Love the world cannot behold the full manifestation of God in that Church which was meant to be the "Body of Christ" in the world, and "the Habitation (fixed abode) of God in the Spirit." For the lack of this unity in Love the eternal purpose of God's Love cannot find its fulfilment either as respects ourselves or as respects the world.

It is to be specially noted that it is the want of the Love that is the cause of the want of the unity. If the Love that God is, and wherewith He loved us were *in* us, as Jesus sought it to be in us, there would infallibly be the unity He prayed for, and it would be manifested. It could not be otherwise. And if it were manifested, the world would believe. For deep in its heart the world knows that God is and must be Love. It is this Love that it wants and feels that it needs to make it right. The world would see and know that where that Love was manifested in its fulness God Himself was there, the Love that moved and unified all those separate individuals in its sole service. A Higher than man would be thus so manifested that men could not doubt the reality of the Divine presence, and they would be drawn to this God of Love. "Christian unity and love is a moral miracle, a conquest of the resisting will of man, and therefore more convincing than a physical miracle, which is a conquest of unresisting matter. Hence the quarrels of Christians are a perpetual stumblingblock to the world" (Dr. Plummer in *Cambridge Greek Testament*). So supremely important is this Christian unity, and so greatly opposed to the Divine purpose is everything that hinders its realisation or prevents its manifestation, however important we may deem these things in themselves to be.

Now, the indwelling of the Love which would produce this Christian unity is to be reached, Jesus says, by our knowledge of the love of God for us, that love which He had declared to His disciples: "I made known unto them thy Name, and will make it known; *that the love wherewith thou lovedst me may be in them*, and I in them," and He had said before, "that the world may know that thou didst send me, and *lovedst them even as thou lovedst me*." This love of the Father for *Him* was the source of the Divine Love manifested by Him, and, since they had been loved by God with the same love, it should be manifested by them also, and it would be so manifested if *He* were *in* them. As He had said before: "that ye love one another even as I have loved you, that ye also love one another" (xiii. 34). Here is the importance of the words we have emphasised. It was the knowledge of that *love for them* that should be the means of its dwelling *in them* as it had dwelt in Christ Himself. But it is not only the world that does not know that love in its fulness: many of us in the Church do not know it, or so believe in it that it may enter our hearts to possess us. We believe that God loves us; perhaps in a general way we believe that He loved us from all eternity. But we fail to rise to that conception of the love of God which Jesus here teaches His disciples with the purpose of bringing the Divine Love to possess them wholly. We fail to realise that God loved *us* with the same love as went forth to Christ; that He had *us* in His mind in His creation of the world; that we are conceived in this close relationship to Himself, and are here to be the organs of His Love—that this is indeed our *only* true and eternal life. We do not grasp the full significance of our sonship to God in and with Christ as being something not of time merely but of Eternity, having its source in that love of the Divine Son and of all other sons

in Him which was the motive and power of the creation. And we fail too greatly to set before ourselves Christ's great Ideal of Unity in Divine Love with its blessed results. We acknowledge the Ideal; but if we are to take it up in earnest and fulfil it, God's love must be in our hearts as an overmastering power, winning all to itself and making us as completely one therein as the Father and the Son are one—"that they may be one even as we are one." In Christ there was such perfect unity with the Father that the Father's will was His sole concern. It was in complete self-surrender to God and self-sacrifice in His cause and for our sakes that the love of God was so effectually manifested in Him. "For their sakes," He says, "I sanctify myself—consecrate or devote myself"—even to the Cross. And He did it that we might be similarly self-consecrated: "As thou didst send me into the world, even so sent I them into the world. And for their sakes I consecrate myself, that they themselves also may be consecrated in truth." We know how He was in the world, and what the consecration of Himself meant for Him. It was the fulness of the Father's love in Him that led to such complete self-consecration. What we need for the desired unity is the same love, leading to the same consecration, so that all of self may be surrendered, all that is inferior to the sole service of Love subordinated, and only God's purpose move us. "Even Christ pleased not Himself," and "the disciple must be as his Master." It is solely because the Love that dwelt in Christ does not dwell in us in its fulness, as it seeks to dwell in us, that we fail to be *one* as Christ and the Father are one—one through the indwelling of God and of Christ within us. It is for want of that Love that Christian Unity is not realised and manifested, so that we ourselves may be more truly the sons of God and that the world may believe and be saved.

There is a strong feeling to-day, not only in the Church but in the world, for the realisation and manifestation of Christian unity; even those outside the recognised Church feel that such unity is the proper expression of the faith we profess, and that all that is contrary to it is inconsistent with our Christianity. Serious endeavours are being made after it, and reasonable hopes are entertained that it may be ultimately reached. But the teaching of Christ in this wonderful prayer shows us clearly that only one thing can ever bring it about or be its effective manifestation, and that is the possession of Christian hearts by the love which God had for them, the love that is the very love and life of God Himself in us His sons and daughters. This alone can lead us to rise superior to all that distracts and divides, and to make that Love the one all-controlling principle of individual lives and of Churches. And it is, Jesus taught, the manifestation of that Love in the Church, as one Body united in its sole service, that should be the means of leading the world to God. It was for this, and not for some other reason, that Jesus prayed for this unity. And since it is the very love of God *for* us that is to be *in* us it is important that we should rise to the full height of the conception of that Love as it is stated in this Farewell Prayer of our Lord's.

W. L. Walker.

THE APPENDIX TO THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

I. The Author of St. John xxi. and the Editor of the Gospel.

In two papers published in the Expositor, October and December, 1912, I made an attempt to examine the position, in the form in which Spitta maintains it, that in chapter xxi. we have the work of the same hand that edited the Johannine "Grundschrift," and expanded it by interweaving reflections of his own, so as to produce chapters i.–xx. as we have them now. I would now like to add some positive reasons for the position that the author of the Appendix, whom I shall speak of as A, was dealing with a document over whose composition he had no control. His whole attitude, in other words, is the attitude that deals with an objective fact. He had reasons of his own, which we shall see presently, for adding an appendix. The detachment of A from the rest of the Gospel is of considerable importance, inasmuch as it is generally admitted by most critics of the Gospel that A himself believed that he was warranted in attributing the authorship of the Gospel to the Apostle John. The only course left for those who would confine the apostolic element in the Gospel to a meagre Grundschrift is to impugn the correctness of A's judgment.[1]

For reasons that will gradually emerge in our treatment of chapter xxi., it is necessary at this stage to define, if somewhat roughly, the attitude it is proposed to adopt in these papers towards the question whether the Gospel has been edited or not. The presence of a redactor's hand in the Gospel has been greatly exaggerated, often to such a degree

[1] E.g. Bacon, *Introduction*, p. 269, n. 1; *Hibb. Journal*, vol. iii. pp. 372 ff., *Fourth Gospel in Research and Debate, pass.*

as to include the more reflective and apparently less historical portions. We are familiar with the positions adopted by Wendt, Spitta, Wellhausen and Schwarz, but the difficulty is that none of them have reached any appreciable measure of agreement as to their results. One hesitates to add yet another to the Redactional theories of the origin of the Fourth Gospel, and personally I would be constrained, as yet, to admit the hand of an editor only in one or two considerable points connected with the Gospel. Amongst these are (1) the chronological scheme of chapters i.–xii., according to which the narrative of the ministry is arranged according to cycles of Jewish Feasts; (2) the very evident heightening of the miraculous element in chapter xi., superimposed on what is evidently in its original form a simple narrative of raising from the dead. Many of the other so-called heightenings of effect, especially in regard to the Person of Jesus, are more or less illusory. Both these points, however, present insuperable difficulties as regards the historicity of the Gospel, unless we are prepared to see in them the work of an editor, working over, for a special purpose, a mass of Johannine material.

What, then, is his point of view? As regards (1) his motive may be conjectured to be a desire to represent Jesus as consistently keeping the national feasts. (2) has apparently an eschatological motive. The story of Lazarus is placed where it is, as the event that brought the hatred of the authorities to a head, and precipitated the Cross, displacing the cleansing of the temple, as in the Synoptics. The eschatological motive is the commonplace one, that the Parousia is delayed, and many who expected to be alive at His coming are dead. The same motive prompts the editorial additions in such passages as vi. 39b, 40b, 44b (*ἀναστήσω . . . τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ*;) xiv. 1 ff. (which seems to me to have a very close connexion with the thought of xxi. 23). These

particular alterations and additions seem to have been made in order to meet a special eschatological difficulty in the Christian community, that arose subsequent to the time reflected in the original Johannine Gospel. I am well aware that it may appear a very cavalier way of treating an important critical question to speak of it thus in a few sentences, but I am merely indicating a point of view, in order that I may go on to show its connexion with the interpretation of chapter xxi.

As regards v. 28–29, the present writer can find no convincing principle of evidence to justify the conclusion that these verses are in eschatological contradiction to *vv.* 21–27 of the same chapter. On the other hand, in reference to *vv.* 28–29, it is far too simple a solution to say in defence of the unity of the Gospel that, while the Fourth Evangelist has in the main spiritualised the cruder eschatological elements in primitive Christian Messianism, regarding it as no longer adequate to satisfy the contemporary Christian consciousness, the transition from the old to the new has been imperfectly accomplished, and that traces of the old still occur (cf. Moffatt, *Introd.*, p. 537).[1] These " traces " are regarded either as subconscious, or are looked upon " as concessions to the primitive tradition, which " (the Evangelist) sought to conserve in form, even while in substance he broke with it " (Scott, *Fourth Gospel*, p. 308). The question turns on the real attitude adopted by Jesus Himself to the current eschatology, and it seems to the present writer that the grounds of the practice, which is passing into a confirmed habit, of entirely ignoring the Fourth Gospel as a source for the consciousness of Jesus, especially in eschatological matters, requires the closest scrutiny and re-examination. Is there any reason for disbelieving, beyond the undue influence of " consistent " eschatology, that both *vv.* 21–27 and *vv.*

[1] Cf. Holtzmann, *Neutestamentliche Theologie*,[2] ii. 519.

28–29 are essentially true to the consciousness of the Fourth Evangelist, as well as to the thought of Jesus. The words "all that are in their graves" most probably refer to those who died before Jesus came.[1]

The conventional method of regarding such passages as those in vi. and xiv. 1 ff. so as to preserve the unity of the Gospel is to say, as has been pointed out, that they are merely traces of the older and primitive point of view, where the transition to the new has been imperfectly accomplished. The Fourth Evangelist has exposed the eschatological expectations of the primitive community to a process of "Verdiesseitigung," or "Transmutation," a transference of their realisation and fulfilment from the future to the present. The Parousia, Judgment and Resurrection are manifest here and now in the experience of the Christian believer (E. F. Scott, *Fourth Gospel*, pp. 302–3; J. Weiss, *Die Predigt J. vom R. Gottes*, pp. 60 ff.). The passages in question are regarded as erratic boulders in the midst of the Johannine formation. There is, however, another and somewhat neglected point of view.

It is quite true that the passages (vi. 39b, 40b, 44b, 54b; in part, xiv. 2, 3) are surprising as occurring in the Gospel. At the same time the surprise need not be that they indicate correspondence with the primitive Christian eschatological beliefs. These, in so far as they consist in the idea of a consummation of all things that is near at hand, are shared by the evangelist, in spite of his spiritualising, as *vv.* 28–29 and his conception of the Christian community show. *The surprise must be due to the fact that they reflect an eschatological situation that is not really contemplated in the rest of the Gospel.* The consummation expected by the community has not come in its lifetime. It

[1] Cf. Is. xxvi. 19 (LXX). For rejection of these verses as editorial see Wendt, *Lehre Jesu*, i. 249–251; Charles, *Eschatology*, pp. 428 f., 2nd Ed.

is delayed. The first believers are dying, and not many survive. The evangelist has indeed taught that the real return of Jesus has been accomplished when He dwells in the community as the Spirit or Paraclete, and that all that is now looked for is that the number of the elect—no longer confined to "sheep of this fold," but also including "the children of God that are scattered abroad"—should be accomplished, and Jesus be "manifested" (1 Ep. iii. 2). The community—each member of it transformed into the likeness of Jesus—shall see Him as He is. This "consummation" or "final manifestation" is to be distinguished from the real "Parousia," which has already taken place, when the Cross is past, and the Spirit is given to the community. Events, however, proved that this consummation would not take place in the lifetime of *all* this generation, and some provision had to be made for the situation. The nature of that provision is seen—

I. In passages such as vi. 39b, etc., and xiv. 2–3.

II. In chapter xxi., especially *vv.* 20 ff.

As regards I. *it is suggested that in these verses we have the work of an editor, who is not the author of chapter xxi.* At the same time the author of xxi. (A) makes use of the thought contained in them, especially in xiv. 1 ff.

(1) In xiv. 1–3, it is admitted by Heitmüller,[1] and others, that the passage has been edited. Wellhausen[2] sees in these verses a direct protest against the idea of the Parousia as conceived in primitive thought. The "mansions" for believers are already prepared in heaven, and it is not necessary for the risen and ascended Jesus to go to prepare them, and then to return, in order to conduct His disciples thither. "If it were not so, I would have said to

[1] *Die Schriften des N. T.* in loc.
[2] *Das Evangelium Johannis*, pp. 62 ff.

you, that 'I go to prepare a place for you,[1] and come again and will take you to be with myself.'" Wellhausen's suggestion is very plausible, but it involves a rather serious interference with the text.[2]

It is quite evident that the idea of a future Parousia is lurking in the sense of the passage, although the attempt to disentangle the original words from the editorial addition presents great difficulty. For our present purpose we may fix our attention on μοναί as used in xiv. 2. It may be noted that only one word—"place"—is employed in the Sinaitic Syriac Version, where the two, μονή and τόπος, are found in the received text. μονή is an eschatological term, used of the dwellings in the intermediate state, where the dead await the consummation at the Last Day. (Cf. 1 Enoch xxxix. 4 ff., xli. 2, xlv. 3. "Their mansions are countless": 2 Enoch lxi. 2, 3. "For in the world to come, I know all things, how that there are many mansions prepared for men; good for the good; evil for the evil; many and without number. Blessed are those who shall go to the mansions of the blessed; for in the evil ones there is no rest, nor any means of return from them.") In John xiv. 14, μονή is applied to the dwelling of the Father and the Son with the man who keeps Christ's commandments, and this μονή is evidently upon earth. At the same time it is an application of an apocalyp-

[1] W. regards ἐὰν πορευθῶ καὶ ἑτοιμάσω τόπον ὑμῖν as an interpolation (*Ev. Joh.*, p. 63), with some textual confirmation.

[2] Wellhausen says, "Die Frage ist, ob die gesamte christliche Gemeinde durch Jesus mit einem Schlage von der Erde zum Himmel entrückt werde" (*op. cit.*, p. 64). This is undoubtedly a primitive idea, as 1 Thess. iv. 15 ff. shows. If Wellhausen is right in his rendering of the words ὅτι . . . πρὸς ἐμαυτόν in verse 2 as the object of εἶπον ἄν ὑμῖν (omitting ἐὰν πορευθῶ . . . τόπον ὑμῖν as a gloss) the passage *might* be a later revision of the Evangelist, who is emphasising the fact that he did not mean in the earlier edition of his Gospel that the community would be bodily transferred to be with Christ, without its members tasting death. What he does actually teach, in the present form of the words, is that believers at death are kept each in his μονή (an eschatological term, see above), where they await, like those still on earth, the final consummation.

tic idea to the life in the community. We may compare 1 Enoch lxii. 14: "And the Lord of spirits will abide over them, and with that Son of Man will they eat and lie down and rise up for ever and ever." The significance of this for the interpretation of xxi. 22 ff. will appear at a later stage.

Loisy has expressed the meaning of the passage, as it stands, as follows: "Jesus speaks as though He refused to return before the death of His disciples; from which we must conclude that John still maintains, although without much rigour, the perspective of the end of the world within the present generation. He does not, however, conceive the return of Christ as a fact isolated at the close of human history" (*Le Quatrième Evangile*, p. 743).

This admission is of great importance. So far from the Evangelist deliberately spiritualising a body of primitive eschatological thought, he seems to be handling a mass of transmuted eschatological teaching, and his cherishing of the belief in an imminent Parousia is the moulding influence, determining his presentation of his material. On the whole, we may admit that in this particular passage some editorial hand has made a still more cogent application of the same primitive ideas, in view of the fact that believers are dying, and the consummation has not yet come.

(2) In the case of vi. 39, etc., "I will raise him up at the Last Day," not much need be said. The words seem an editorial addition, calculated to remove any impression that *μὴ ἀπολέσω*, or *ἔχῃ ζωὴν αἰώνιον* (*v.* 40) are meant to imply that those who eat the flesh and drink the blood of the Son of Man will not die. In that case, the addition would be anti-sacramentarian, and implies that the words of vi. are interpreted in a sacramental sense. (Cf. Wendt, *Die Schichten im v. Evang.*, pp. 23 ff.)

(3) I shall only suggest here that a further trace of the same editorial hand may be seen in the Lazarus story. The heightening of the effect there, the raising of a corpse that has been in the grave four days,[1] and the interpretation given to the delay of Jesus, all point to an attempt to solve the difficulty of the death of believers before the Parousia, on the basis of the original Lazarus story.

In the following pages the questions are discussed (1) whether the eschatological ideas here attributed to the Redactor of i.–xx. have given to A a clue to the solution of problems that existed in the community for which he wrote regarding the death of John, and (2) whether he has felt it necessary, in view of the fact that Peter in the Gospel is nowhere restored to the position he really occupied in the community prior to his death, to rehabilitate his reputation as a "shepherd." The situation seems to have been, when A wrote, that Peter's authority as an apostle was seriously questioned. The position taken up by the present writer is that just as A has recourse to the Gospel in order to meet the difficulty regarding the death of John—especially to the eschatological passages mentioned—so he finds in chapter x. a set of ideas, which, together with the adaptation of another Redaction, embodied in xxi. 15 ff., enable him to restore Peter to his original place in the community.

II. St. John xxi. in Relation to the Allegory of the Good Shepherd.

We are prepared in xxi. 1–14 for the scene which follows. It describes the formal restoration of Peter to the place in the community which he has forfeited by his denial.

[1] Implying probably a belief that on the fourth day the spirit finally leaves the body, and, therefore, Lazarus was really dead (cf. xi. 13–15, and Schmiedel, Art. *Gospel of John*, Encycl. Bibl.).

A evidently felt that Peter could not be left in the position indicated in xviii. 27, or even xx. 4–10. Only of "John" is it said *καὶ εἶδεν καὶ ἐπίστευσεν*. Jesus addresses him by his old name of Simon. He is spoken of as *Σίμων Πέτρος* in verse 15, but the name is quickly changed to *Πέτρος* merely, in verse 17.

Two points call for special consideration in connexion with these verses. (1) *Is there any special significance in the use of the two words ἀγαπάω and φιλέω?*

(2) *Peter is restored to the position of "shepherd," and in verse* 18 *his martyrdom is foretold. Can we see here any connexion with the thought of chapter x.?*

(i.) Abbott (*Diatess.* 1436, 1595–6, 1716 *d–f*, 1728 *m–q*) has sought to prove that the distinction of *ἀγαπάω* and *φιλέω* is a real one. He translates *φιλέω* = "take as a friend," something that remains "after the higher love (expressed by *ἀγαπάω*) has passed away" (*Diatess.* 1716 *f.*). He explains the use of the two words in xxi. 15–18 as indicating that Peter prefers, out of penitential feeling, to use the lower word of his own affection for Jesus, and that Jesus gradually restores him the right to use the higher. Some of the examples quoted by Abbott seem really to negative this position. He quotes, for example, from Xen. *Mem.* II. vii. 9, 12 (*Diatess.* 1728 *m*), and certainly in this passage the terms seem to be used with a remarkable freedom as regards interchange of meaning between them. Liddell and Scott (*ἀγαπάω*, 4) say that *ἀγαπᾶν* (*diligere*) "strictly differs from *φιλεῖν* as implying regard or affection rather than passion." This distinction seems to be borne out by Abbott's second quotation from Dio. 44, p. 175, *ἐφιλήσατε αὐτὸν ὡς πατέρα καὶ ἠγαπήσατε ὡς εὐεργέτην*. *Φιλέω* in both passages seems to indicate the affection that exists between members of the same family; and *ἀγαπάω* the affection between benefactor and recipient. At the same

time the distinction cannot be unduly pressed. Abbott also points out that three times in the Gospel, in the mouth of Jesus, φιλέω = "taking into the circle of friends."[1] This is suggestive, and indicates that what distinction there is, is in favour of a special meaning of φιλέω *as a term that might be used in Christian circles as expressing the higher relationship between Jesus and the members of the Christian community.*[2]

The passage from Plato's Lysis (215B) quoted by Abbott is a specially instructive one, but can only be made to support his position by a whimsical translation of φιλέω and ἀγαπάω. The passage and the context fully support the contention that ἀγαπάω can be used in a special sense of "loving" those who have it in their power to be benefactors. This "love" for a benefactor is, at first, regarded as a previous stage towards the "love" expressed by φιλέω. "What he does not desire (ἀγαπάω) he cannot love (φιλέω). "And if he does not love (φιλέω), he won't be a friend (φίλος). Clearly not."

The Dialogue, however, goes on to discover that the speakers have been proceeding on a wrong notion of friendship (τὸ φίλον) In the Socratic manner, it is proved that if ἀγαπάω is a previous stage of φιλέω, then "the good can never be friends at all with the good," for the reason that

[1] xi. 3, 36; xx. 2. The unusual ὃν ἐφίλει ὁ Ἰ. in the last passage might signify an emphasis on the idea that Mary naturally communicates her distress to one who was more really a member of the community than Peter at the moment. Wellhausen regards xx. 2–10 as editorial, and if his view be accepted, we would then have another instance of the affinity of thought between A and the Redactor of the Gospel, and the manner in which A has adapted R's ideas to his particular problem in xxi. (cf. xv. 15).

[2] Since the above was written, I find that Bousset (*Kyrios Christos* (1913), pp. 186 f.) lays great emphasis on the use of φίλος in the Gospel, as describing a member of the Christian community. He further points out that there are indications that φίλος was used as a name for the members of certain of the mystery cults.

the relation of benefactor and recipient cannot exist between the good, since the "good" man is sufficient in himself. "Is there any possible way by which such people can be brought to desire (*ἀγαπάω*) each other?" The Dialogue, therefore, goes on to prove that, in the love of the Beautiful, the good have a common regard, which unites them to one another, and brings about the relationship expressed by *φιλέω*. The solution is found along the lines of what is described as an "old proverb, *κατὰ τὴν ἀρχαίαν παροιμίαν τὸ καλὸν φίλον εἶναι*, "the beautiful is the friendly." Can it be that some such idea is at the root of the distinction emphasised by A, especially as we shall presently see that there are grounds for thinking that he has in mind chap. x, where Jesus is described as *ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλός* (v. 11)?

It is quite impossible to escape the conclusion that a real distinction is implied between *ἀγαπ.* and *φιλ.* in John xxi. 15–18. I would suggest that the distinction has something to do with the idea of the Christian community, that conception of the body of believers as a community distinct from the world, "in the world but not of it," which pervades the thought of the Gospel and appears clearly especially in chapters xv., xvi. and xvii. A is solely concerned with the restoration to Peter, not of his supremacy in the Church, but of his place in the community. He may possibly be seeking to meet some view that Peter's death before the Parousia was due to the sin of his betrayal. He had cut himself off from the community. Apparently he has before him some "Johannine" material, such as underlies verses 1–14, describing an interview between Jesus and Peter, and belonging to a pre-Resurrection narrative. This he has adapted to his purpose in xxi. Accordingly the grounds of his distinction between *ἀγαπ.* and *φιλ.* would be either (1) an apparent distinction that he found already existent in the Johannine material which he employs. The

two words are found elsewhere in the Gospel, but φιλεῖν only in xi. 3, 36, xx. 2, v. 20, xvi. 27 (bis), xii. 25, xv. 19; or (2) a distinction which he introduces into a text that employs only one word, such as is suggested by the SS. But (1) is preferable. On either alternative, A emphasises the distinction.

Peter, then, is restored to the office of shepherd in the Church. That the dialogue rests on some historical basis is suggested by the appearance in 1 Peter of the idea of the "shepherd" (1 Pet. ii. 25; v. 2–3). Φιλέω is the word properly used of the inner relationship of soul that ought to exist between the believer and Christ, and between fellow-believers. Although φιλέω is not found in the first Epistle, something corresponding to its meaning is found in iii. 18 μὴ ἀγαπῶμεν λόγῳ μηδὲ τῇ γλώσσῃ, ἀλλὰ ἐν ἔργῳ καὶ ἀληθείᾳ.

The dialogue opens with the question, Σίμων Ἰωάνου, ἀγαπᾷς με πλέον τούτων; This can only refer to Peter's boastful assertion, "Though all shall be offended, yet will not I" (Matt. xxvi. 33–5). It is noticeable also that in the Matthew passage and in Mark (xiv. 27) the prophecy about the smiting of the shepherd from Zechariah xix. 7 is uttered by Jesus. Jesus uses ἀγαπάω, a word that emphasises the practical proofs of affection as well as the emotion, so as to suggest to Peter his conduct. Peter in his replies all through claims by the use of φιλέω his real heart-relationship to Jesus, and implicitly his membership of the Christian community. His ignoring of the word ἀγαπάω is to be interpreted penitentially, but he has "been begotten again unto a living hope by the Resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead." It is this hope that he expresses in the use of φιλέω. In His third question (ver. 17) Jesus uses Peter's own word φιλέω, and Peter is grieved at the thought that his inward relationship with Jesus,

and implicitly his place in the community as a believer, appear to be doubted.[1] He passionately appeals to Jesus' omniscience, and in particular to his knowledge of the human heart (cf. ii. 25), *Κύριε, πάντα συ οἶδας, συ γινώσκεις ὅτι φιλῶ σε.*

(2) Peter is restored to the position of shepherd, and in verse 18 his martyrdom is foretold. Can we see here also any connexion with the thought of chapter x. ? Reasons may be adduced for believing that certain portions of the thought in xx. 15–24 are connected with the denunciation of the false shepherd in x. 1–16. Any one reading these words, with the case of Simon Peter in his mind, might be led to apply the same condemnation to him. A may have felt such a danger for the reputation of Peter in the minds of readers of the Gospel. Peter acted like a "hireling" in betraying his Master's cause. He saw the wolf coming and fled. He had not fulfilled, in accordance with his own promise, the duty of the good shepherd, in willingness to lay down his life. He had not entered into the office that was claimed for him "through the door," but had climbed up some other way. Enemies might say that he was "a thief and a robber," and the Gospel left him without any reinstatement after his denial.

It is suggested that considerations like these were in the mind of A when he wrote. He seeks to show that, after all, Peter is admitted by the "door," which is Christ.[2]

[1] The Received Text implies that Peter's grief is not so much because the question has been put three times, but because, on the third occasion, *φιλέω* is used by our Lord. On the other hand, the SS. implies a form of text in which evidently no distinction of words is made. It has "Simon was grieved because three times Jesus spake thus to him." It is impossible to decide whether the distinction of *ἀγαπ.* and *φιλέω* was introduced by the Johannine writer in translating from an Aramaic source which had only one word, or A is responsible for the distinction in xxi. The former is the more probable.

[2] x. 7, adopting the usual reading. It is much more in accord with Johannine thought to identify Jesus, in mystical fashion, with a detail

This reference in the mind of A to the thought of x. 7 is confirmed to some extent by the language of x. 9, "I am the door; by me, if any man enter in, he shall be saved, and shall go in and go out, and find pasture." This verse is regarded as a difficulty in its present position by some critics, and it is sometimes looked upon as an editorial interpolation. The difficulty is largely diminished if we regard it as referring not to the sheep, but to the shepherds, the under-shepherds, of the early Church (so Purchas, *Johannine Problems*, chap. vi.). Jesus is the Door, and the under-shepherd must enter the fold by the door. We may compare verse 2, "He that entereth in is a shepherd of the sheep." The word *σωθήσεται* is interesting, and can only be meant in an eschatological sense. It represents the condition of being a true member of the community, and is used in a similar sense in iii. 17, v. 34, xii. 47. The use in xi. 12 seems to be equivalent to "he shall recover," but it is noticeable that verse 13 represents, in Johannine fashion, the disciples as misunderstanding Jesus' words, and it might be suggested that here we have another instance of the double meaning attached to certain words, of which the Fourth Evangelist is fond. At any rate, in x. 9 the meaning would appear to be that even the hireling, if he at last enters by the door, "will be saved," and go about his business of tending the sheep, and will "find pasture" for them. The whole context speaks of shepherds as the subject, and not of the sheep. A would naturally fasten on this statement in the Gospel as a basis for Peter's restoration. In xxi. 15–18, he is forgiven his past falsehood, because he comes at last to the door, and is given freedom to go out and in, and to find pasture for the sheep. "Feed my sheep."

in the preceding parable, other than the obvious one of the shepherd, as is done later in verses 11, 14 (cf. xiv. 6, "I am the way: *οὐδεὶς ἐρχ. . . . εἰ μὴ δι' ἐμοῦ*. Spitta, *Ev. J.* 215).

Again, if this is a correct interpretation of the thought of A, the reference to the martyrdom of Peter in xxi. 18–19 is doubly intelligible. He is thinking of x. 11. Peter is yet to have an opportunity, not only of laying down his life for the sheep, but also of laying it down in the same way as his Master, on the Cross. It is important also that his death should be prophesied by Jesus. This would be a complete answer to any doubts arising out of the fact that he had died before the Parousia. Underlying the statement in verses 18, 19, there may be some tradition like the *Quo vadis* one in connexion with Peter, and A knows of it; but the reference to x. 11 is not therefore excluded. It is difficult to escape the impression in xxi. 18–19 that two traditions have been blended. One is an implicit rebuke of Peter's independence and impulsiveness. Old age and experience of life will place their constraint upon him. The other is a prophecy of the *Quo vadis* type. The important point is that A seems to be dealing with a chapter in a document over whose composition he had no control. He is simply using such a passage as chapter x. in order to found on it his argument about Peter's death and its significance.

III. St. John and the "Mansions" of xiv. 2.

Evidently in the community for which A wrote there was very great difficulty about the death of John. An erroneous impression had risen, created by the longevity of John, that he would live to see the Parousia. It is clear from the narrative (xxi. 20 f.) that John is now dead, and the erroneous impression is due to the words of Jesus, spoken to Peter on some occasion, "If I will that he tarry till I come." Incidentally it may be noted that the passage presents extreme difficulty to those who hold the theory of the early martyrdom of John. The perplexity involved is clearly

seen in Moffatt's treatment of the passage in his *Introduction* (pp. 575–6). He repudiates the ordinary interpretation that A's purpose is to remove an erroneous impression created by John's longevity. On this theory, the situation would be that John lived so long as to create the impression that he at least would be alive when the Parousia occurred. "It is obvious that this would exclude the identification of the beloved disciple with John, the Son of Zebedee, if the early martyr-death of the latter is accepted as historical" (ib., p. 575). At the same time, Dr. Moffatt holds that A does identify the beloved disciple with the Son of Zebedee. He says, "It is even possible to interpret xxi. 20 f. in such a way as to permit its reference to John the Apostle, in the light of his early martyrdom," although he puts forward his interpretation "with some diffidence." The basis, however, of his interpretation is an interesting one, especially from the point of view of the use made of eschatological ideas in the Gospel. In Mark ix. 1 = Matthew xvi. 28 = Luke ix. 27, Jesus says that some of His disciples would survive until He returned in Messianic glory. "The Fourth Evangelist has already generalised and spiritualised the saying in viii. 51–2 in characteristic fashion; in xxi. 23 it is at once applied specifically to the beloved disciple and also cleared of popular misconceptions. . . . The point of xxi. 20 f. lies in the contrast between *ἀκολουθοῦντα* and *μένειν*."

There can be no doubt that Moffatt and others are right in holding that *ἀκολουθεῖν* in this chapter, and probably in other passages in the Gospel (e.g., xii. 26, xiii. 36), is used in the sense of following on the way to martyrdom. The other disciple is already "following" in this pregnant sense (v. 20), *βλέπει τὸν μαθήτην . . . ἀκολουθοῦντα*. Peter is represented as saying, "Lord, what of this man?" "Is he, also, to suffer a martyr-death?" "Is he not to be one of those who shall not taste of death until Thy coming, judging from his long

life already ? " Jesus' answer is, " Yes. If I will," etc. A is thus confronted with an apparent inconsistency in the words of Jesus, which was causing perplexity and doubt in the Church. Jesus appeared untrue to His promise. He is also confronted with the belief in the immediate Second Coming within the lifetime of the first generation ; and while he himself is compelled to give up that form of the belief, he still holds that there will be a Second Coming, at no very distant date. How then is he to establish the veracity of Jesus ? He does so by a characteristic explanation of the saying. " Jesus did not say, when He spoke of the disciple as ' abiding,' that he would not die. His death before the Coming is quite consistent with His words, although it seems to contradict not only these words, but also the hope of the community, strengthened by his continuing to live long, and shattered by the fact that his life on earth has now been ended." Jesus said, not *οὐκ ἀποθνήσκει*, but *ἐὰν αὐτόν θελ. μένειν ἕως ἔρχομαι.*"

The usual interpretation of the words *ἐὰν α. θ. μένειν*, *κ.τ.λ.* in *v.* 23 is that A subtly emphasises their hypothetical nature. May it not be suggested that the emphasis is on *μένειν*, interpreted as A wishes it to be interpreted ? It is already evident that he shares the view of the primitive Church about the Parousia, which is yet to take place, and here, in his interpretation of *μένειν*, he seeks to save the veracity of our Lord by implying that Jesus actually contemplated the death of John when He so spoke, and meant that the disciple would *abide* in the intermediate state until the Parousia, when, with the other saints who inhabited the *μοναί* of the Father's house (xiv. 2), he would be received into glory. This idea he found in the Gospel he had before him in xiv. 2.

It may therefore be suggested that *μένειν* is interpreted by A in xxi. 23 as the verb corresponding to the noun *μονή*. Jesus did not mean that John would be alive at His coming,

but would inhabit a mansion of the blessed, whence Jesus would bring him to be with Himself. He did not say *οὐκ ἀποθνήσκει*, but that he would "remain," *μένειν*. A thus meets the difficulty raised by the fact that the Beloved Disciple had died by the time that he writes. It is, of course, a strained and artificial interpretation, and does not really appreciate the point of Peter's question. Peter's difficulty is that the Beloved Disciple's future has not been foretold as martyrdom, but that he appears to be destined to see the Parousia. This seems to him a much more desirable experience than death beforehand. Hence the tone of Jesus' rebuke according to A. He anticipates what is unspoken in Peter's words, and gives expression to it. "If I will that he *abide* till I come, what is that to thee?"

Ακολουθοῦντα, *v.* 20, is not found in ℵ* (orig. scribe). ff² (6th cent.). In all the Syrian MSS. the word is wanting in verse 21. It is omitted by Blass, Spitta, Wellhausen in verses 20, 21, and in verse 21 by Tischendorf. "It is precisely by *ἀκολουθ.* that Peter is distinguished from the unnamed disciple. He takes offence, not because that disciple is following, but really because he does not follow" (cf. Wellhausen, *Ev. J.*, p. 99; Spitta, *Ev. Joh.*, p. 10, "Ein nachfolgen—*ὁ Πέτρος*.") If *ἀκολ.* be omitted from the original text, and regarded as an editorial addition (in ver. 21, as a later gloss), we may suppose that A implies that John actually did die a martyr's death, but that this death is not really inconsistent with Jesus' prophecy regarding him. He does actually await the Parousia in his *μονή*.

The whole weight, then, of this interpretation of A's purpose rests on the emphasis on *μένειν* in verse 23. It may be objected that such an emphasis is purely conjectural. In answer two points may be urged. (1) Not only does A attach his thought to the idea of *μονή* in xiv. 2, but there are echoes of the same idea in the preceding context. The

passage xiv. 1–3 is preceded by a reference to Peter's following to martyrdom, in the allusive style of the Evangelist (xiii. 36). In xiii. 37 the content of ἀκολ. is set forth in *τὴν ψυχήν μου ὑπὲρ σοῦ θήσω*. Jesus is speaking of His going away (*ὑπάγειν*, *v.* 36), and Peter asks, *ποῦ ὑπάγεις*; The question is followed by Jesus' answer, *ὅπου ἔγω ὑπάγω οὐ δύνασαί μοι νῦν ἀκολουθῆσαι, ἀκολουθήσεις δὲ ὕστερον*. Then in verse 38 occurs the prediction of Peter's denial. If, then, we suppose that A is, as it were, searching the Gospel for an explanation of the misinterpreted saying, he has ingeniously fastened upon a passage most suitable to his purpose. The passage both speaks of another question of Peter's and contains the unusual expression *μονή*.

(2) E. Schwarz (*Ueber den Tod der Söhne Zebedaei* (pp. 49 f.) interprets *μένειν* in chapter xxi. as meaning that John remained in the grave, but did not see corruption. This is in accordance with the legend referred to in the Monachian Prologue to the Gospel (ed. Corssen, *Texte und Untersuchungen*, 15. 1). The words are these, "*hic est Johannes qui . . . positus est ad patres suos tam extraneus a dolore mortis quam a corruptione carnis invenitur alienus.*" The words "a corruptione carnis alienus" can only mean that the body underwent no process of decay. Schwarz attributes this meaning to A in his use of *μένειν* in xxi. 23, "Den Schlaf im Grabe, der kein Tod war, und den Körper unverweslich liess: das war als Ersatz für das Martyrium und besondere Vergünstigung des Herrn dem Lieblingsjunger zu Teil geworden." He also cites Augustine (*Tract. in Joann.* 124, t. iii. 2, pp. 597 ff. ed. Maur.), who again refers to the legend. The interest of these citations lies in the idea they suggest, viz., that the legend is the outcome of an interpretation of *μένειν* in xxi. 23. It is fantastic to suppose that A has in his mind such an idea as the freedom from decay of the corpse of John. He directly bases his idea, as we have seen, on the idea of *μονή* in

xiv. 2 f., and his motive was purely eschatological. The Jewish mind at this stage when A wrote did not concern itself with speculation as to what happened to the physical body after death (cf. Charles, *Eschatology*, 2nd Ed., pp. 450 ff.).

All this is only another indication that A is dealing with a document (1–20) whose composition and construction he did not control. I do not accept the view that the hand of A is seen in the rest of the Gospel. The Editor of the Gospel really shared the same eschatological views as the original Evangelist ; but he was faced with a new problem, the death of believers before the Parousia. Hence his alterations in vi. 39 f., xiv. 2 f., and in the Lazarus story. It is within the bounds of possibility that these alterations are the work of the Evangelist himself in later years, but the superimposed chronological scheme, if it is from the hand of an editor, would negative this supposition. The Evangelist might revise his own work, but he could not radically reconstruct the chronological scheme. What xxi. reveals to us is a mind occupied with the same eschatological problem as is found emerging in the Gospel, edited as we have it. A, however, directs his attention towards the difficulties raised by the denial of Peter, and in particular the death of John, as prominent members of the community. He seeks to base his solution in both cases on what he found written in the Gospel itself.

R. H. Strachan.

THE "SINGLE" EYE.

THE saying of Jesus, "If thine eye be single (ἁπλοῦς) thy whole body shall be full of light," has excellent documentary support. It is independently attested by our first and third evangelists—we will use the current designations "Matthew" and "Luke"—forming part of that older material which they use in common, but do not obtain from Mark. In critical parlance, the saying belongs to Q, and Q has been decreed off-hand a source (Quelle) and identified with the *Logia*, the compilation of the precepts of Jesus reported by Papias, on unknown authority, if any, to have been made by the Apostle Matthew "in the Hebrew tongue." The only three characteristics specified for this reported work exactly reverse those of the material designated Q. This material was (1) not in "Hebrew." (2) It was not confined to precepts, but largely concerned with the mighty works of Jesus in their bearing on the problem of His person;—it even dealt with the person and work of His forerunner. (3) It was not compiled by an Apostle nor by any first-hand reporter. These three points can all be proved from the Q material itself. But the temptation to "identify" besets the critic as well as the excavator. By the time the sixteen different reconstructors of Q have settled their differences and found a discernible unity somewhere in the pile of fragments, some reconciliation may be found with Papias. Meantime, however, it will be safer to use the letter Q purely as an algebraic symbol. Let it designate simply *material* of the type described (i.e. coincident matter of Matthew and Luke after subtraction of Mark), without prejudging the question of its derivation, whether apostolic or secondary, oral or written. We have not even determined as yet whether the Q material comes all

from a single source, or from several sources of different kinds.

But is it proper to speak of a Q saying as "independently" attested by Matthew and Luke? Why may not one have taken it from the other?

Wernle's demonstration of the mutual independence of Matthew and Luke in his admirable *Synoptische Frage* is too long for transcription. We must content ourselves with a reference to this work and a challenge to critics who maintain that the differences in treatment of the sayings are due solely to the individual fancy of the particular evangelist, to produce a parallel instance from the treatment either accords to Mark. In the particular case of the saying, "Let thine eye be single," both sense and historical occasion are made utterly different in the Matthaean and Lukan versions respectively, though the saying itself is reported in almost identical terms. In the absence of disproof this must be taken to show that Matthew and Luke are following diverse tradition. Where either so treats material taken from Mark it is for the sake of adjusting it to another form of the tradition. But the assumed variant form is here just the point in question. If Matthew in borrowing from Luke (or Luke in borrowing from Matthew) has not arbitrarily altered occasion and sense—an unlikely supposition—he must have had some *independent* report unknown to us; for Mark has no reference to this saying whatever.

Unfortunately the very differences which verify the authenticity of the saying increase the difficulties of its interpretation; and it is with its interpretation that we are now concerned. A recent discussion by one of the keenest and ablest of New Testament critics denies indeed the authenticity.[1]

[1] W. Brandt in *Z. ntl. W.* xiv. 2 (May, 1913), under the title, "Der Spruch vom Lumen Internum," p. 107. The article is to be continued as we write, but the critical discussion of meaning and authenticity shows the author's

But this is chiefly on the ground of an interpretation which we take to be erroneous, and is no less opposed to the Lukan than the Matthaean context. An interpretation consonant with at least one of these, and in agreement with the general style, bearing and animus of the precepts of Jesus as otherwise known should remove all reasonable objection. It may not establish the authenticity, but will at least put the burden of proof on him who disputes it. We shall have attained the strongest attainable documentary attestation for a saying of Jesus; and that must have no small historical weight in the case of a Teacher whose sayings were treated as having more than human authority within a few months at the outside from the date of their utterance.

So far as Matthew is concerned we agree with Brandt that neither sense nor reported historical occasion of the saying, "Let thine eye be single," can be correct. It forms part of an agglutination in vi. 19–34, the material of which is all found in fuller and more appropriate contexts in Luke, not connected with the Sermon on the Mount, but each factor having its own historical occasion. Together with the adjoining material the saying on the "single eye" has thus been employed by Matthew to fill out the first of the five great discourses of Jesus wherein this evangelist includes most of his material not borrowed from Mark. These agglutinated "discourses" give, in fact, to the Matthaean Gospel its distinctive character.[1] The first occupies Matthew v. 1–vii. 27. We designate it The Sermon on the Mount, recognising as its basis the briefer discourse on Thank-

view. The saying, says Brandt, is "an attempt to set forth the value of self-consciousness, and to urge the exercise of it. . . . We may be fairly sure it does not come from Jesus."

[1] The five discourses each conclude with a distinctive formula borrowed from Q (Luke vii. 1) and nowhere else employed. It marks the transition to new material in Matthew vii. 28; xi. 1; xiii. 53; xix. 1 and xxvi. 1.

worthy Goodness, reported (with omissions) in Luke vi. 20–49. The two Q discourses principally utilised by Matthew as a quarry to fill out his sermon are that in Luke xi. 1–13 on Prayer, and that in Luke xii. 13–34 on Treasure in Heaven. The additions in Matthew vi. 9–13 and Matthew vii. 7–11 are taken from the discourse on Prayer, while the greater part of the context in which our own saying lies embedded in Matthew vi. 19–34 is taken from the discourse on Treasure in Heaven.

The motive for the attachment is transparent. From the Beatitudes in v. 1–12 to the description of Thankworthy Worship in vi. 1–18 the thought of the entire "Sermon" in its Matthaean form is dominated by the thought of heavenly "reward" (μισθός). The Beatitudes introduce it (v. 3, 12), the Antitheses contrasting the "righteousness of God" with that "of the scribes and Pharisees" repeat it (v. 46), the section on Works of Devotion is full of it. Worship "to be seen of men" exhausts its "reward." True worship must be in secret, "else ye have no reward with your Father" (vi. 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 16, 18). At this point begins Matthew's great addition from the discourse on Treasure in Heaven, given according to Luke on occasion of Jesus' being called upon in a synagogue to settle a dispute over inheritances. It appears in the form of an adjuration to *seek this heavenly reward*, and into the midst of it are inserted the sayings, "Let thine eye be single" (vi. 22–23), and "No man can serve two masters" (vi. 24), both given by Luke in other connexion. It is impossible in this Matthaean context to mistake the sense. *Thus framed* the saying reflects the exhortations of St. Paul: "Set your mind on the things that are above, not on the things that are upon the earth." "We look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen; for the things which are seen are temporal, but the things which are not seen are eternal" (Col.

iii. 2, 2 Cor. iv. 18). To Matthew accordingly a "single" eye means an unwavering, consistent aim. He is desirous of fortifying the effort of the disciple to attain the "treasure laid up in heaven." The same motive leads him to introduce the final division of the "Sermon" in chapter vii. with the warning against censorious judgment (vii. 1–5) and carelessness of things holy (vii. 6).

Matthew, then, has taken the word ἁπλοῦς—the *Greek* word—in its primary and literal sense. He understands Jesus to be inculcating "singleness" of aim. Is this the real meaning?—We regard it as impossible (1) because in *both* forms of the saying the contrasted adjective is not anything signifying "wavering" or "inconstant," but πονηρός, i.e. "evil," "malignant"; (2) because the Lukan narrative context is wrongly disregarded by Matthew. It is consonant with another sense of ἁπλοῦς, the exact antithesis of πονηρός. Moreover, Luke's account of the occasion of the saying is not without support in Mark and John.

(1) In the Greek language, but in no other, so far as known to the present writer, the adjective meaning "single" (ἁπλοῦς) is applied to the act of *giving*, in the sense "liberal," "generous." The adverb (ἁπλῶς) has the corresponding meaning. Thus in Romans xii. 8 he that "giveth" is urged to do it ἁπλῶς, which the King James version wrongly renders "with simplicity." The Revisers properly correct this to "with liberality," putting in the margin "Gr. *singleness*." A still more undeniable instance appears in James i. 5, where he who lacks wisdom is bidden to ask of God, because He "giveth to all liberally (ἁπλῶς), and does not even upbraid." The reason for this remarkable linguistic usage is perhaps to be found in the customs of primitive races in respect to giving.

To this day the traveller in oriental countries will find himself beset by a host of "givers" whose offerings are far from disinterested. From the instant tents are pitched the

natives swarm about offering all kinds of trifles ostensibly as "gifts." The more they are refused the more is acceptance insisted on. Etiquette requires that the fiction of "giving" shall be maintained, even when, as in the biblical case of the cave of Machpelah (Gen. xxiii. 8–16), the equivalent to be paid is hinted in no dubious terms.

The Arab proverb "a gift begets a gift" discloses the unvarnished truth. The giving is not "single," but expects an equivalent (more often an increase) in return. Against such disguised barter the Platonic ideal of "goodness" sets the "giving" of God, who seeks nothing in return for His abundant generosity, who can be neither enriched by men's offerings nor injured by their wicked acts. In Wisdom of Solomon xii. 19–22 the principle is applied to the problem of the unequal distribution of suffering. It is *παιδεία*, "discipline." Omnipotence cannot be vindictive, hence the calamities God sends are to be received as the chastening of sons. The Q discourse on Thankworthy Goodness applies it to good. God's giving and serving, unlike man's, is "single," without thought of return. "He is kind even to the unthankful and the evil." Therefore "thankworthy goodness," "the righteousness of God," consists in liberality and service pure of all thought of "recompense." Hospitality should be shown to the poor, the lame, the halt and the blind, not to kinsfolk and rich neighbours, "lest they also bid thee again, and a recompense be made thee" (Luke xiv. 12–14). Kindness should be shown to "enemies." Lending and giving should not be "to receive as much again," but as "children of the Highest." This "royal law" of "goodness" pervades the teaching of Jesus, appearing with special distinctness in the Q elements of the Gospel of Luke and in the Epistle of James. But as we have seen in an earlier article, its basis is a conception of the transcendent nature of God. And this larger thought

of God found expression much earlier in Platonic and Stoic religious writers. It would seem to have permeated the later Jewish thought through the medium of the Wisdom literature. The adjective ἁπλοῦς, with its corresponding adverb, is almost a technical term for this distinction between the "royal goodness" of God, and the interested serving and giving of men, with their petty calculation of benefits, their ulterior motives, their tacit hopes of being "recompensed again." God gives "singly." He has no *arrière pensée.* His bounties are not a bait, but "good" and "perfect" gifts (i.e. gifts both kind and complete), coming down from a Father of all lights with whom is no variableness neither shadow cast by turning. If ever modern entered into the full spirit of this noble Platonic thought of the "single" goodness of God it was Lowell in the familiar lines from "The Vision of Sir Launfall"—

> In the Devil's booth are all things sold,
> Each ounce of dross costs its ounce of gold,
> For a cap and bells our lives we pay,
> Bubbles we buy with a whole soul's tasking;
> 'Tis only heaven that is given away,
> 'Tis only God may be had for the asking.
>
> What is so rare as a day in June?
> Then, if ever, come perfect days,
> When heaven over earth her warm ear lays,
> And tries its chords if they be in tune.

On the point of this twofold sense of the word "single" (ἁπλοῦς), vital as it would appear for any thorough discussion of the meaning of the saying, Let thine eye be "single," Brandt defers discussion.[1] He merely "remarks by way

[1] His second article, published since the above was in type in *Z. nlt. W.* xiv. 3, has on pp. 189–201 a very full and scholarly discussion of "the meaning of the words ἁπλους and πονηρός," where it is shown on the basis of Edwin Hatch's study in *Essays in Biblical Greek* (1889), that the use of πονηρός and ἀγαθός (or ἁπλους) with ὀφθαλμός is a Hebrew and Septuagint idiom to express a generous or malignant and envious disposition. Cf. Matt. xx. 15.

of anticipation that πονηρός as applied to the human eye means "ungracious," and for ἁπλοῦς the meaning "liberal" or "generous" seems to be demonstrable. At a pinch the meaning "righteous" might serve; that is, if we assume the author's meaning to be that the Creator imposed upon the eye the duty of giving light: the righteousness of the eye will then consist in giving light. On the same assumption πονηρός is of course to be understood in "the opposite sense." Brandt's interpretation sets out from the idea that the main object of the saying is to answer the question: Whence has the body its light? Its conclusion is that the "generous" or "liberal" eye is that which is generous to the body which it illuminates. The "evil" or "ungenerous" eye is that which like an untrimmed lamp sheds a feeble and insufficient light in the inner chambers of consciousness. This interpretation Brandt supports by citing Proverbs xx. 27, "The spirit of man is a lamp of the Lord, searching all the chambers that are within," and the reference of St. Paul to the human self-consciousness in 1 Corinthians ii. 11. He holds therefore that "the original sense of the saying" is "an attempt to set forth the value of self-consciousness, and to urge its exercise."

If this be the real sense of the saying we must agree with Brandt that it cannot be authentic. We may grant the possibility of some early psychologist having used imagery of this kind to encourage the habit of introspection; but the probability that Jesus ever wasted His breath on such sayings, or that His disciples cared to record them, may safely be dismissed from consideration.

The true starting point of the interpreter should be from the phrase (identical in Matthew and Luke) which admits no dispute, "If thine eye be evil" (πονηρός). Notoriously an "evil" or "malignant" eye (ὀφθαλμὸς πονηρός) is that which is directed in "envy, malice, and all uncharitable-

ness" on those around. The eye is not only (in the ancient mode of thought) a "lamp of the body," furnishing light to its occupant, the soul. It is also the organ of observation and of judgment. It may be kindly, charitable, "generous" (ἁπλοῦς); or it may be envious and malignant (πονηρός), darting venomous glances from the quiver of poisoned shafts within. The single treatise on 'Simplicity' in *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (Issachar) will show that Brandt is unquestionably right in rendering ἁπλοῦς "generous" or "liberal," and πονηρός "ungenerous," in the saying under consideration. So long as the latter adjective remains the known quantity in the problem Matthew's understanding is completely excluded. The opposite of an "evil" eye is not an eye unswervingly fixed on the highest gain. But neither is it the psychologist's eye. We can see nothing to connect this saying with the references to self-consciousness in Proverbs or St. Paul. On the other hand it is very closely akin to the passage in *Test. of Issachar*, § 3, "I never spoke against anyone, but walked in 'simplicity' of eyes" (*οὐ κατελάλησά τινος . . . πορευόμενος ἐν ἁπλότητι ὀφθαλμῶν*). Harsh judgment is the sin rebuked. It is the object of the saying to point out, that the eye looks inward as well as outward. The eye is the organ of observation and judgment, and as such is commonly characterised as "benevolent" or "malignant," "single" (i.e., generous) or "evil." But the eye is also the source of the soul's own light. It is the "lamp," or (as moderns would be more apt to say) the window of the body. The occupant of the body (the soul or self) cannot with impunity close its window to the light that brightens all the outward prospect. He cannot take a jaundiced view of the world outside, making censorious judgments, putting evil constructions on the dealings of God and man, without by the same act darkening the inward world, the abode of his own

soul. This is a lesson in morals and religion, not in psychology; and it is thoroughly characteristic of Jesus. It is the inculcation of that supreme charism of the Spirit of Christ, which, as St. Paul describes it, "beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things," and "never faileth." The saying, "Let thine eye be *single*," must be (if we judge by the warning against its opposite and the penalty threatened): Be generous in judgment. Put the kindliest construction on what you see and experience.

(2) If with this meaning of the saying in mind we turn to its historical occasion as related by Luke we shall find abundant ground for the belief that, here as in the adjoining excerpts, Matthew has disregarded a genuine historical context which Luke has preserved. It is indeed the fashion among critics who have precipitately identified Q with the *Logia* of Papias to disparage the narrative introductions of Luke as mere editorial fictions drawn from the material itself. Convinced as they are that the precanonical source was a mere "collection of Sayings of Jesus" they are reluctant to grant any basis in older tradition for the Lukan narrative, especially when it fails, as in the present case, to appear in Matthew. And it must be admitted that the Lukan narrative framework often is demonstrably mere editorial fiction. Such cases we do not here consider. In other cases, such as the introduction to the discourse on Prayer (Luke xi. 1) and that to the discourse on True Wealth (Luke xii. 13 f.) Luke's historical occasions imply a knowledge of Jewish environment quite beyond the reach of most Gentiles, and give every indication of authenticity. Such is the case with his account of the warning of Jesus against the "evil eye." In Luke xi. 34 f. it forms the climax of a denunciation against "some" who had declared that His exorcisms were wrought by collusion with Beelzebub. "Others" had demanded a "sign from heaven." Both are grouped together in the

paragraph beginning: "This is an evil generation" (xi. 29–32). The evil generation has shown wilful blindness in its judgment of Him, and therefore "in the judgment" will be condemned by the Ninevites, who repented without a sign at the preaching of Jonah, and by the queen of the south, who for a lesser wisdom came from the ends of the earth. It is true that the *framework* of the warning against an "evil eye" (verses 33 and 36) is inappropriate. It is an exceedingly clumsy attachment of the saying about setting the "lamp" upon the lampstand which we have in Mark iv. 21 and which Luke had already transferred to his pages in Luke viii. 16 along with its companion verse Mark iv. 22. Now we have it a second time and the companion a little later (Luke xii. 2). This is coutrary to the demonstrable effort of Luke elsewhere to avoid duplication. This and the extreme awkwardness of the joiner-work suggest that the combination antedates the work of "Luke," a skilful stylist. Whether "Luke" or Q be responsible for the combination historical context and meaning alike demand a separation of the saying "Let thine eye be single" from the framework. Freed from this it appears in the Lukan narrative as the climax of Jesus' denunciation of "some" who "said He casteth out devils through Beelzebub" and others who "tempting Him sought of Him a sign from heaven." They are types of an "evil generation" which had disregarded tokens more cogent than such as availed with the Ninevites and the Queen of the South. The "darkness" of those who were in this case was due only to their own "evil eye." It was a wilful blindness on the part of men who professed to see. We have reason to think that the original application was more specific than that which Luke reports.

Luke and Matthew do not stand altogether alone in reporting the Blasphemy of the Scribes and Jesus' warning against the Evil Eye. Mark has two employments of this

material which in Q we find attached to the incident of the Exorcism of a Dumb Devil. One of these Markan employments seems to be introduced proleptically in Mark iii. 22–30 as a sort of parenthetic off-set to the story of how Jesus' mother and brethren opposed Him, deeming Him "beside himself." Its chronological displacement is apparent from the fact that the "scribes" who make the charge in verse 22 are defined as "those who had come down from Jerusalem"; whereas this same delegation are introduced in Mark vii. 1 as if on their first appearance ("And the Pharisees came unto Him, and *certain* of the scribes who had come from Jerusalem"). Now the coming of this delegation of scribes from Jerusalem so casually mentioned by Mark is anything but an unimportant fact. Such a visit of inspection of Jesus' work from the great Jerusalem authorities is just the event to mark a crisis in Jesus' Galilean ministry. It explains admirably the violence of the collision and Jesus' subsequent retirement. But it is only Mark who mentions it. In Luke there is no characterisation of those who make the blasphemous charge. In Matthew they are simply "the Pharisees." Not even in Mark iii. 22 does it appear who the authors of this evil judgment are, but only in Mark vii. 1. The latter position is easily seen to be the true one, from the fact that the rest of the colloquy proceeds in Mark vii. 1–23 along the same lines as the Q section of Matthew-Luke—inward *versus* ceremonial cleanness. Now it is quite noteworthy that while Mark in this case, as in all others, has but the briefest abstract of the Q discourse, and has indeed, as already observed, no report whatever of the saying, "Let thine eye be single," he *has* toward the close of the paragraph a reference to its counterpart the "evil eye," and (significantly enough) it is mentioned jointly with "blasphemy," the sin committed by the scribes from Jerusalem. The mention occurs in verse 22 as part of the list of inward

defilements. These are "evil thoughts . . . an evil eye, blasphemy, arrogance, madness."

The relation of the Fourth Gospel to Q material has the same free and untrammeled character as Mark's. Instead of the exorcism of a dumb devil as the occasion for Jesus' chief altercation with his self-righteous opponents, the occasion is made the healing of a man born blind by means which recall the Markan healing of the blind man of Bethsaida (Mark viii. 22–26). We also recall the fact that Mark has used two parallel healings, the one of a dumb man (vii. 31–37), the other of this blind man, in the immediate vicinity of his report of the Collision with the Scribes, and that in the Matthaean form of the story the exorcism is of "a demoniac blind *and* dumb," so that "the dumb man spake *and saw.*"—But to return. In John ix. the story of the healing also concludes with a denunciation of "the Pharisees" because of their *wilful blindness.* Not only so, but their sin is declared to be *unforgivable*, as in Mark iii. 29=Matthew xii. 31=Luke xii. 10; while the altercation concludes in John x. 20 f. with the words: "And many of them said, He *hath a devil and is mad*; why hear ye him? Others said, These are not the sayings of one *possessed with a devil.* Can a *devil open the eyes* of the blind?"

Remote as are the relations of Mark and John to the Q saying, they are surely enough to justify the historical context reported by Luke as against the artificial collocations of Matthew. In the most authentic tradition the sayings: "If thine eye be 'single' thy body shall be full of light, if it be 'evil' thy whole body shall be full of darkness" was connected with the Blasphemy of the Scribes. It formed a part—perhaps the close—of that awe-inspiring rebuke with which Jesus met the perverse and malignant verdict of the religious leaders upon His work. They had spoken not against Him, but against the Spirit of God. Their blasphemy

could never be forgiven, because it was wilful. Had they been really blind, like the healed sufferer, they "would have had no sin," but professing to see "their sin remained." They had called light darkness and darkness light; they had made the lamp of the soul, their eye, "evil."

These corroborations from Mark and John of the historical occasion of the saying reported by Luke are sufficient to prove it something more than an editorial fiction. Taken together with the facts of common usage regarding the phrase the evil eye they would appear sufficient to establish sense and context alike, at least so far back as Q, the source known (it would seem) to all three Synoptists, if not to all four evangelists. If these conclusions hold, the gain will not be small to criticism. New and important light will be thrown on problems of the history of gospel tradition and interdependence. But that with which we are now chiefly concerned is simply the meaning of Jesus. Of the authenticity of the saying we need no longer doubt. Is it not singularly in harmony with His spirit and life? Was not His own "inward light," the brightness, serenity and faith exhibited in His life of God-like service and love no less clearly than in His "preaching of glad tidings of peace"—was not this light the reflected radiance of an eye "single" with the goodness of the Father in heaven?

B. W. Bacon.

IMAGE-WORSHIP AND IDOL-WORSHIP IN THE OLD TESTAMENT.

THE worship of the *golden calf* in the neighbourhood of Sinai has ever been regarded as a humiliating spectacle. Does it not grieve us to see that the majority in Israel were disposed, soon after their deliverance from the Egyptian servitude, to offend against one of the fundamental principles of the Mosaic religion? We can well understand that the prophet Moses was so indignant at their action that he shattered the tables of stone. What a bitter disappointment for him was that worship of the *golden calf!* He had thought he might venture to hope that he had raised his people to a higher religion, and now he was compelled to witness this falling away of the main body. But in what, then, we ask, really consisted the religious error which is usually called the worship of the golden calf? *Was it image-worship, or was it idol-worship?*

The prevailing opinion is that it was merely *image-worship*, and this view is justified. Israel on that occasion simply repudiated the second principle in the Decalogue. They disobeyed the commandment which reads, "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness," etc. (Exodus xx. 4 f.), i.e., thou shalt not make unto thee as an *objective representation of the Deity*, a plastic or otherwise constructed copy of things which are in heaven above, or in the earth, or in the water. This is undoubtedly the true meaning of that passage. The prohibition refers only to the construction of such images as visible representations of God. This is made clear in the following words of the

second commandment, "Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them." It is also evident from the entire attitude of the Old Testament religion towards art, as I was obliged to prove in detail in my *Geschichte der alttestamentlichen Religion* (1912, p. 104 f.), because not a few modern writers fancy they have discovered in the so-called Bedouin ideal the progenitor of the prophetic religion.

The conduct of the masses of Israel at Sinai affords, then, only a melancholy proof that man's spiritual eye dwells lingeringly *on outward manifestations*. The general body of the people were at first unwilling to accept as a reality that fact which is so distinctly emphasised in Deuteronomy iv. 12, etc., that when the law was given on Sinai Israel only "heard the voice of the words, but saw no similitude." What a misleading influence on the general multitude of the people must also have been exercised by the custom of all surrounding nations to present their deities to the outward view in imitations of visible objects!

There were motives enough to inspire these masses of Israel with the desire to set forth their deity also in objective form before the outward eye. A point of secondary interest for our understanding of their action lies in the answer to the question, How did these circles within the Mosaic religion conceive the idea of choosing a small bull or a calf as the visible image of *their* God? The most probable answer to the question is this: The masses of Israel were influenced by memories of Egypt when they made that choice. Is it not a striking circumstance that the image of a calf was selected, not only by the people who had come out of Egypt, but also in later times by Jeroboam, who had also returned from Egypt? (1 Kings xi. 40; xii. 28–30). It is highly probable that this choice is connected with the worship of the white bull Mnevis, of which small models were made and dedicated to the sun-god Ra, who had his chief temple

at Heliopolis,[1] in the near neighbourhood of Goshen. Further material will be found in my *Geschichte* (1912), p. 40. On pp. 200–221, after a careful examination of all the more recent objections, I have once more proved decisively that the root-principle of the absence of images in the legitimate worship of God in Israel must have been laid down in the age of Moses.

But ought not the worship which the multitude of Israel practised at Sinai to be more properly described as *idol-worship*? Had not these Israelites quite forgotten the God Jahve or Jehovah, who was proclaimed to them by Moses, and turned themselves wholly to other gods? Had not these masses of Israel actually repudiated the *first* principle of the Decalogue (Exod. xx. 3)? An occasion for the serious study of this question was afforded us quite recently by an article published in the *Sunday School Times* of September 6, 1913, by Professor M. G. Kyle, of Philadelphia. He says that the worship of unfaithful Israel at Sinai was idol-worship. What are his reasons for this assertion?

In the first place he repeats a statement, often found elsewhere, that the Egyptian Apis-worship "was not the veneration of the image of a calf, but of the living calf itself." To this we reply, (1) that the golden calf of Exodus xxxii. might have had none the less an indirect association with the calf of Apis. (2) Professor Kyle, who had not at the time of writing read my *Geschichte der alttestamentlichen Religion*, has overlooked the facts there set forth (p. 40), about the small figures of the white bull Mnevis, which were dedicated to the sun-god Ra. It is noteworthy, in any case, that the eminent Egyptologist A. Wiedemann, in his recently published book *Der Tierkult der alten Aegypter* ("The Animal-Worship of the ancient Egyptians") has reached a similar conclusion to mine, that the worship of

[1] The On of Genesis xli. 45, of which we read in Joseph's history.

the golden calf had a connexion with Egypt. Professor Kyle finds support for his thesis in the cry with which the people at Sinai greeted the golden calf when it was formed: "This is thy God, O Israel, which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt" (Exod. xxxii. 4). He translates the opening of the passage thus [as in the English Authorised and Revised versions]: "These be thy gods, O Israel," etc.; and he regards this translation, which Luther and others selected (following the Septuagint and the Vulgate) as grammatically justified. But this translation, with the plural "gods," is inadmissible on several grounds.

It rests, first of all, on a violation of the natural meaning of these words, which is forced on our attention by the context. Had not the demonstrative pronoun "this" a direct reference to the one calf which Aaron had prepared and set forth in view of the people? Even in that sense the demonstrative word indicated only a single deity. But it is clear also from the concluding words, "which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt," that in the people's cry of greeting that calf was regarded as a visible image of the Saviour God Jehovah. The plural, "these," as used in this address, is now at once divested of its element of surprise.

The translation preferred by Professor Kyle and others, with the plural "gods," rests, in the second place, on the misunderstanding of a linguistic fact. The Hebrew expression *elohîm*, with its plural ending, is one of many plural forms which in Hebrew indicate a singular number only, as for instance, *zoqûnîm*, "old age," or *bînôth*, "insight"; and for that reason *elohîm* is best translated "deity." This form *elohîm* admittedly refers in hundreds of passages to *one* God only (Gen. i. 1, etc.), and in *this* sense, as a merely *verbal* plural, is very naturally construed sometimes (Gen. xx. 13, etc.) with a plural verb and adjective. I have set these points out in detail quite recently in my *History*, etc.

(pp. 130–133), in replying to the views of Professor B. D. Eerdmans (Leyden). Further, the expression "which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt" makes it impossible, thirdly and lastly, for us to think of "thy God" as meaning any other than the God whom Moses had proclaimed as the deliverer of Israel from the slavery of Egypt (Exod. iii. 6 ff.).

Professor Kyle has no authority, therefore, for his assertion that the words of Exodus xxxii. 4 contain an allusion to the idolatrous worship which a section of the Israelitish people practised in Egypt (Josh. xxiv. 14, etc.).[1] How could the idols whom an unfaithful multitude in Israel served in Egypt have helped these worshippers to quit the land of Egypt? Almost all scientific interpreters of Exodus xxxii. 4 now rightly adopt the translation, "This is thy God, O Israel, who brought thee out of Egypt."[2] The opposition to this rendering is based in the last resort on the *confusion between image-worship and idol-worship.*

In confusing these two expressions Professor Kyle has had an associate in recent days who is certainly quite unknown to him. It was Friedrich Delitzsch who in the third of his writings in the Babel-Bible controversy said: "The Book of Kings informs us that the northern kingdom of Israel after its separation under Jeroboam I. worshipped as its national gods which had "brought it out of Egypt" two golden calves which were set up in Bethel and Dan; and during the entire two centuries of its existence clung to this *idolatry*, as compared with which the Sumerian-Babylonish worship represents an incomparably higher stage, while

[1] The significance of this and other nearly related passages of the Old Testament is closely examined in my *Geschichte*, etc., pp. 27–34, with special reference to the modern hypotheses of Ch. Piepenbring, B. Stade, G. Jahn, and others.

[2] Cf. Driver, in *Cambridge Bible*, on Exodus xxxii. 4, and Barnes, in the *Cambridge Bible*, on 1 Kings xii. 28, in opposition to McNeile, in the *Westminster Commentary*, on Exodus xxxii. 4.

even that of Baal and Astarte is preferable to it" (*Babel und Bibel*, iii. p. 39). But the writer here blames unfairly the official worship of the kingdom of Samaria. For even if the golden calves of Bethel and Dan are in one place (1 Kings xiv. 9) called "other gods," they were really intended to be symbols of Jehovah. This is made evident by three facts. It follows first of all from the friendly relations which existed between the kings of northern Israel and the prophets Elijah and Elisha, etc., who strove for the true worship of Jahve, the Lord. The same conclusion may be drawn, secondly, e.g., from Hosea iv. 15, according to which the oath was sworn at Bethel, "The Lord liveth." And thirdly, it follows from the circumstance that in the sources that calf-image worship established by Jeroboam, that "sin of Jeroboam" (1 Kings xiv. 16, etc.) is distinctly separated from the worship of Baal and Astarte, and the latter devotion is represented as a much worse degree of Israelitish worship. For in reference to King Ahab, who with his wife Jezebel, a princess from the Phœnician Sidon, attempted to re-introduce the heathenism of the Canaanites, we read these most characteristic words, which are too often neglected, "And it came to pass as if it had been a *light thing* for him to walk in the sins of Jeroboam the son of Nebat, that he took to wife Jezebel . . . and went and served Baal and worshipped him" (1 Kings xvi. 31). So we see that in the historical sources the worship of two golden calves introduced by Jeroboam I. is represented as the *minor degree* of the religious aberration of Israel as compared with the worship of Baal and Astarte. But the twentieth century Assyriologist in criticising the Old Testament has *exactly reversed the matter*.

It follows also that in the words we have cited above he is mistaken in stamping the image-worship of Israel as idol-worship, as Professor Kyle has done again more recently.

Let us remark in passing that the former Assyriologist, even with his unhistorical conception of the sin of Jeroboam, would not have been justified in describing the Sumerian-Babylonish worship, in comparison with Israel's veneration of calves, as an " incomparably higher stage " of religiosity. In his next work (*Babel und Bibel*, iv. p. 28) he actually ventured to say that the Old Testament authors were " altogether " too contemptuous in their judgment when they mocked at the Babylonian divinities " as idols of wood and stone " (Isa. xliv. 9 ff. ; xlvi. 1 f.).

But what proof is there to justify this reproach directed against the men of the Old Testament ? The proof, it seems, lies in the following words of Professor Delitzsch : " The inmost sanctuary of the Babylonian temples occupied so small a space that it was sometimes entirely filled by the pedestal of the god's statue, and hardly permitted freedom of movement to a single priest. For this very reason the image as such could not have been intended as an object of popular veneration " (*Babel und Bibel*, iv. p. 28). As if this could possibly prove anything against the actual veneration of the Babylonian divine images ! Was it not sufficient that the priests should lavish worship upon them ? For that, at least, we have convincing testimony in the letter of Jeremiah v. 28 (=Baruch vi. 28),[1] in " Bel of Babel," v. 2, etc. We must ask, further, Were those Babylonian divinities always shut up in the small space of the innermost sanctuary ? Among the facts brought to light by the excavations, this is noteworthy among others, that the image of the god Marduk (Hebrew, Merodach) was driven along the majestic procession-street in Babylon at the time of the New Year festival.[2]

[1] Full evidence for the fact that these interesting statements actually refer to the worship of the Babylonians, has recently been supplied in the scholarly work of W. Naumann, *Untersuchungen über den apokryphen Jeremiabrief* (1913), pp. 3–31.

[2] *Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orientgesellschaft*, Nr. 6, p. 10.

It was the king's duty at the time "to grasp the hands" of Marduk,[1] and at this festival the images of other gods were also borne in solemn procession to Babylon.[2] The religious spokesmen of Israel had therefore very *good ground* to oppose, with direct reference to the Babylonians, the custom of making images of gods (Isa. xl. 19 ff., etc.). They did this especially for the sake of those among their fellow-countrymen who might have been inclined after the Babylonian captivity to allow themselves to be so led away by the outwardly splendid ceremonies of the Babylonian religion as to forget the old principle of the *purely spiritual worship* of God.

The spokesmen of Israel who referred to the manufacture of gods' images with a satire which we can readily understand, must be defended also against Delitzsch's charge that they mocked at the Babylonian deities as "idols of wood and stone." Let us note, first, that they never did so in express terms. Can any passage be pointed out in which they distinctly said that the Babylonian gods were *no more* than images? They expressed quite definitely the very opposite view. For the same prophet who characterises the manufacture of divine images as a pitiful effort (Isa. xl. 19 f.; xli. 7, etc.) cries out in triumph, "Bel boweth down, Nebo stoopeth" (xlvi. 1), and it is obvious that he does not mean simply the overthrow of images of these gods.

Secondly, the Old Testament authors must not be accused of a falsification of facts if we gather from their language here and there that in rejecting the Babylonian images of gods they repudiated the gods themselves. For it is a fact very easily comprehensible on psychological grounds that

[1] H. Zimmern, in *Keilinschriften und Altes Testament*, p. 515.

[2] "Neighbouring towns also brought the images of their gods to Babylon to join in this procession" (Hastings' *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, ii. p. 318).

among peoples which love images of their divinities, the divinities themselves are regarded as all one with the figures, and that the images themselves often receive the same veneration as if they were holy things and heavenly beings. Striking instances of this very regrettable practice are found, as we know, in all stages of religious development, and even in Christianity. How unjust it is, then, to condemn Old Testament writers in words like those of Delitzsch, because the frequent blending of the divine image with the divinity itself has caused Bible authors to express themselves here and there as if the images of gods were the gods themselves.[1]

Thirdly, we must defend the authors of the Old Testament writings against such a charge, on the ground of their religious faith. For the development of the true religion of Israel carried with it an ever clearer recognition that the gods of other peoples were powerless beings and vain imaginations. In my *Geschichte*, pp. 145, 199 and 357 and 473 f., I have set out this truth in detail. Filled as their minds were with this more perfect understanding, the writers of the later Old Testament books were all the more inclined to put the images of the heathen on the same footing as the gods themselves. No one will deny them the right unless, like Delitzsch,[2] he regards the religious conceptions of the Babylonians as living gods. But what student who has once been convinced of the unique character of the Old Testa-

[1] The author of Chronicles, indeed, adds in his account of Jeroboam's innovations (1 Kings xii. 28) "he-goats" to the calves (2 Chron. xi. 15, R.V.), and in Tob. i. 5 we read according to the best Greek text, "All the tribes which fell away together sacrificed to Baal the cow" [τῇ Βάαλ τῇ δαμάλει]. In this form of the narrative there lies a coarsening of the original facts. Such an exaggeration may have arisen in the post-prophetic period (my *Geschichte*, p. 416 ff.), partly from the greater sensitiveness of the religious conscience and partly from the natural tendency in this direction.

[2] Friedrich Delitzsch in *Babel und Bibel*, iv. p. 28, expressly states that the Babylonians had "living gods."

ment prophets and their experiences could possibly share that view ?[1]

In order to define the main point clearly, I close my article with the following sentences :—

The Old Testament represents with conspicuous clearness the two religious practices which may best be described in the expressions "idol-worship" and "image-worship" (idololatry), as *two separate things*, as the two primary violations of lawful religion.[2] If, then, the representatives of that religion, among whom we reckon the historical writers of the Old Testament, occasionally speak of the image of a god as if it were itself a god (e.g. Exodus xxxii. 4 ; 1 Kings xii. 28) they did so merely in the effort after conciseness of expression. Every Old Testament critic ought, therefore, to regard it as a duty laid upon him by the laws of historical justice to distinguish clearly between definite statements of fundamental principle and language chosen in the effort after the utmost possible brevity, combined with usefulness for religious practice.

Ed. König.

STUDIES IN CHRISTIAN ESCHATOLOGY.

III. The Return of Christ.

The *prima facie* meaning of the Gospel records is that Jesus spoke differently of the Parousia on different occasions. He is reported as having said not only "There be some here of them that stand by, which shall in no wise taste of death till they see the kingdom of God come with power" (Mark ix. 1), but also "So is the kingdom of God, as if a man should

[1] The reader may compare the remarks on the origin of Old Testament religion in my *Geschichte*, pp. 92–118.

[2] In the decalogue, Exodus xx. 3, and v. 4 f. = Deuteronomy v. 7 and v. 8 f.

cast seed upon the earth . . . and the seed should spring up and grow . . . first the blade, then the ear, then the full corn in the ear " (Mark iv. 26–28). Taking one passage with another, here and elsewhere, we obtain an impression that at one time Jesus expected the Parousia in the immediate future,[1] at another beheld it far off, with an intervening period of gradual diffusion, at still another declared His inability to foretell its day or hour. In point of authenticity there is no appreciable distinction between these *logia*. If it be maintained that verses predicting an early Return show the influence of later Church thought, it may be also argued, in view of the contrast between St. Paul's earlier and later Epistles, that incipient Christian theology tended rather to soften eschatological emphasis, and that we are scarcely justified in charging to its account those Gospel passages which, to us, are difficult. But at all events one thing is clear—if Jesus could ever speak of the End as

[1] I am not prepared to exclude the idea that Jesus' predictions of an early consummation—their authenticity being assumed—may have been, like all true prophecy, morally conditioned. We have no right to make the choice one between saying that the later Church unconsciously tampered with His words, reading into them its own hectic dreams, and pronouncing Him a visionary. All promises are relative to faith. By this is not merely meant that only faith can hear the promise given, which is true enough ; it is also meant—and this is what matters now—that only faith is able to receive the fulfilment. Throughout all His life Jesus asked for daring faith in the infinitude of God. Hence we are putting out of our minds what may be a vital factor if we decide *a priori* that it is wrong to regard our Lord's references to an impending climax as a great challenge to believing trust. Are we in a position to say what might have happened had the challenge evoked the response He wished for ? For a powerful exposition of this idea, see Professor Hogg's *Christ's Message of the Kingdom*. He writes : " It may be only to our foolishness that His great hope seems foolish. May the Kingdom not really have been at hand—not merely that beginning of it which actually came to pass, but its consummation too ? May it not have been simply the incredible obstinacy of human mistrust that needlessly prevented what might really have taken place ? Our Lord knew that with the Father all things were possible—that nothing could be too glorious for God. Would He not, then, have been false to His Father if He had counted an early consummation unlikely ? " (pp. 36–37).

distant, then, although sayings in another vein do occur, chronology had for Him slender importance. For the date of the Parousia He cared little; what He dwelt upon, in thought and speech, was its certainty and its abruptness.

In the literature of primitive Christianity the Parousia holds a commanding place. The writers of the New Testament are men who look on intensely to the great event; life for them is moulded by a transcendent hope. Redemption as an experience, so far from making the Return of Christ otiose, renders it the chief object of anticipation. We are children of God, St. Paul felt, but one day there is coming a *full* manifestation of the sons of God; we have the first-fruits of the Spirit, but we are waiting, on that very account, for the redemption of the body. The second Coming was to accomplish what the first Coming had left undone, and various prophecies, originally pointing to the advent of a pre-existent Messiah from heaven, were now applied directly to His Return. Only the first chapter of the story had been written. The Christian movement would grow by inherent Divine energies to an end, and with the end Christ would appear in person to vindicate His universal power.

It is pathetic, as the New Testament moves on, to observe how the circle of those who may be privileged to behold the Parousia is narrowed by degrees. At first all Christian believers hope for it in their life-time; then it is promised to "some"; finally, in the closing chapter of the Fourth Gospel, there is a guarded reference to the beloved disciple only: "If I will that *he* tarry till I come, what is that to thee?" But the postponement thus necessitated by the will of God never seemed likely to be long. Nothing was expected in the least resembling the centuries of history.

In later ages, during periods of acute spiritual transition, this anticipation of an impending Return has repeatedly flamed up. Souls of an apocalyptic intensity have foretold

its imminence again and again, and special prodigies or tribulations have been regarded as the herald of Christ's final revelation as Judge and Saviour, one Church Father after another seeing in the events of his own day the promised tokens of the last things. The Reformation was itself an age of keen eschatological sensibility—a fact which explains much in the otherwise inexplicable apathy of the Reformers to missionary obligation. Antichrist has been discovered in a variety of Popes, in Luther, in Calvin, in Napoleon ; and, to take a last instance, Bengel saw reason to believe the world would end in the year 1836. Many people, when they read such things, and consider how often the attempt has been made to write history before it happened, are under a temptation to dismiss the Parousia as devoid of either recognisable meaning or spiritual importance. Let us ask whether it is really so.

By way of preface, we may note how the fact that the hope of Christ's Return has remained unfulfilled is a reminder of the difference between true prophecy and apocalyptic. The difference is briefly this, that apocalyptic fixes, sometimes in mechanical and artificial modes, the details of the consummation to which a given process is leading, irrespective of human conduct, one chief reality in the case; whereas in prophecy only the consummation itself is fixed as certain. The apostolic anticipation of the Parousia, therefore, illustrates a point of view which applies to every prediction in the Bible—unfulfilled in a certain sense while yet true in spiritual import. There is a sermon by F. W. Robertson on " The Illusiveness of Life," in which this conception is stated boldly : " God's promises never are fulfilled in the sense in which they seem to have been given. The promise in the letter was unfulfilled. For ages the world's hope has been the second advent. Yet the Son of Man has

never come; the promise itself had a deeper meaning."

No one, then, can really preach the Second Coming *verbatim et literatim* from a text of the New Testament. Even when he appears to be doing so, he has unwittingly introduced changes which deflect the initial sense; for the primitive anticipation, as it comes to light in the Epistles, was that the Lord would come presently, before many years had elapsed. It is impossible to transfer *this* expectation from the first century to the twentieth, or to pretend that in so doing we are speaking in the sense of the apostles. No ground for this procedure can be pointed out in the New Testament. We have no reason to suppose that any apostolic writer, in predicting the Return, was thinking of our age.

Does this mean that the thought of the Parousia has lost its religious significance for the modern Christian mind? By no means. Let us inquire what reasons we have for agreeing with a writer who said the other day that "the Gospel of Redemption is incomplete if it fail to include the hope of Christ's Second Coming." [1]

First, the promise of Return is calculated to rebuke a false and superficial optimism. Nothing in the outlook of Jesus is more solemnising than the complete absence of what in reverence we may call sanguine or facile expectancy. When He spoke of triumph, as He did frequently, it was not as of something destined to occur within the present order. "My kingdom is not of this world." Undeniably He foretold that the Divine cause would make progress on the earth, but evil too is pictured as enjoying a real progress of its own. Tares grow along with wheat. Nowhere is there the faintest indication of a peaceful conciliatory evolution of the Kingdom, gently absorbing hostile forces as the ages lapse. There exists to-day a well-known type of

[1] J. G. Simpson, *What is the Gospel*, 20.

thought which takes the perfectibility of human nature by circumstances as its working theory, regards character as the mere product of nurture and environment, and insists that the true path to the *summum bonum* for man is to conduct life strictly according to scientific principles. And even when ideas of this sort are put aside, owing to the acknowledgment of Jesus' supremacy, the prospect held forth is an earthly one. "The wonderful life promised by Christianity," says a recent author, "will, like all the inferior forms of life, realise itself through a process of gradual and orderly evolution extending over many generations of mankind. . . . We believe that there is in store for mankind a far higher and more joyful existence than it has at present; and we may even hope for the conquest in time of sickness and death." Now in this, despite elements that merit keen sympathy, there is something quite alien to Jesus' mind. The consummation of the Kingdom is not in the last resort dependent on the efforts of man. It is indeed true that Jesus affirms the power of prayer to expedite the climax, for the Father's purpose is no iron fate, and in response to prevailing entreaty the End may be hastened. At the same time, nothing could be more unlike Jesus' thought than the hypothesis of a mundane evolution, moving to its goal by infinitesimal and homogeneous increments and completing itself in a certain state of specifically earthly life. For Jesus the new order comes from God, by interposition, how and when He may think best; the redemptive crisis is such as wholly to outstrip the powers of nature. Thus the idea of a Parousia recalls us to the Divine omnipotence as the source of all hope. It insists on those points in life where civilisation cannot help us in the least—points at which nature invades our personality, bringing home our mortality and sinfulness as real things from which it is impossible we should ever be self-redeemed. Complete sal-

vation can only be a new order from above.[1] It is the sense of this which, amid much that is fanciful, gives so poignant an interest to Father Tyrrell's last book. As he writes: "Shall progress ever wipe away the tears from all eyes? Shall it ever extinguish love and pride and ambition and all the griefs attendant in their train? Is it enough to give a man bread for his belly and instruction for his brain? Prolong life as it will, can progress conquer death, with its terrors for the dying, its tears for the surviving? Can it ever control the earthquake, the tempest, the lightning, the cruelties of a nature indifferent to the lot of man?"[2]

Out of the same great thought, also, there comes a suggestion for each new age of preachers. We set forth on our life-work deeply conscious of the infirmities of our predecessors. Only let us put the truth more credibly, we say; let us strip off the old superstitious orthodoxies and state the Gospel in modern terms, and everywhere men will listen and believe. A natural belief, and there is probably no man worth his salt but begins by sharing it. But experience brings disillusionment. It is the old world, we discover, and each generation has to face for itself the inexorably personal task of becoming Christian. There is no panacea that will rapidly sweep the masses of men under the power of religion—not the newest theology, not the pomp of Rome, not even the needed stress on social reclamation. It is not the fact that the world has been waiting for us. There were brave men before Agamemnon; the Gospel was

[1] This is a very different view from pessimism, in its pseudo-Christian form or any other; for pessimism is the belief that already the world is intolerably bad and will steadily grow worse. Over against this despondency the Gospel places the truth that the world belongs to God, not to evil, whatever hold evil may have got upon it. But it also faces the moral facts of experience, which declare unmistakeably that life in this world is a moral conflict from which no one in any generation, however distant, and whatever civilisation may come to, will be dispensed.

[2] *Christianity at the Cross-roads*, 120.

preached with truth and faithfulness long before we were born, and both then and now it has encountered that permanent impulse or tendency in human life which the New Testament calls "the fleshly mind," and which Jesus saw persisting until the end of the world.

Again, our Lord's prophecy of His Return, as coincident with the arrival of the Kingdom in power, betokens a profound consciousness on His part of His own transcendence and centrality.[1] We underestimate the greatness of the personal claim involved in His eschatological utterances. As it has been put, "The eschatological hope anticipates a future in which the bliss and relief are mediated through the divine Christ. . . . The attitude of Jesus to the future kingdom meant neither a purely supernatural deity, nor an attitude of passive unethical expectancy upon the part of man, nor an order of things in which His own person was transcended."[2] His mind on this topic is quite clear. It is not merely that death could not vanquish Him; it was that He bent death itself into the service of His great mission, and even prior to Calvary beheld the Cross change into a throne. He laid His hand on all that should follow, saying, "It is Mine." Even there, in the final order, He would be mediator of the Divine life. All that can be called salvation, here or hereafter, is the effect and outflow of His Person, and bonds of an indisseverable strength will unite Him in the unseen to His obedient people.

Two supreme things are implied in this. (*a*) By thus announcing Himself as Lord of the future, Jesus indicated the reality of a vast supernatural order of love, power and wisdom, the stores of which are at His disposal, and on which His followers may draw. His supremacy is not merely ethical; it involves also transcendent energies and

[1] See Professor Andrews' paper in *London Theological Essays.*
[2] Moffatt, *Theology of the Gospels,* 69–70.

agencies. The Kingdom which He proclaims is " an order of things in which God's omnipotence is available to be freely drawn upon for the perfecting of the world and of human life." This, we may believe, was at least part of the truth underlying those elements in Jesus' teaching which ostensibly mean an early Parousia. He employed a conceptual form native to the Jewish mind to express His own absolute control of the future. What filled His mind was the assurance that after His departure the powers of an endless life would still reach men through Him ; and it is necessary to recollect that the *nearness* of the unseen and Divine, which Greek thought expressed in spatial terms, was more naturally set forth by Jewish thought in terms of time. My Father, said Jesus, is prepared to give now that which is perfect, and I have power to execute forthwith His perfect will.

It is in this direction, further, that the teaching of the Fourth Gospel appears to lead. That Gospel first marked the inclination of Christian thought to turn from exciting hopes of an imminent cataclysm and to dwell chiefly on the living presence of Christ with His Church. The End is not forgotten, but the strongest emphasis is placed on the actual and verifiable coming of the Risen Lord to dwell with men. Whatever be the exact form of His words, an undertaking is given that they shall have His spiritual fellowship ; the living grace that went out from Jesus in Palestine, lifting away guilt and fear, will be enhanced by death, not lessened. Here is a fundamental truth embraced within the idea of a Parousia, which may be disengaged from its apocalyptic vesture. It is not the whole truth, as we shall have cause to note, but it is basal. It means primarily the existence of a supernatural order of relationship ; a kingdom or system of experience in which Christ and all who trust Him are united, and in which faith and prayer elicit miracle ; and

plainly enough it was this certainty that prevented the collapse of Christian religion when hopes of an immediate Advent died out. St. John filled the gap by the great conception of Christ's presence in the Spirit. Recent expositors of the New Testament have too often omitted this absolutely vital fact, that the anticipation of a speedy Return was never alone, by itself, in the apostolic mind. From the very outset it was accompanied, and therefore conditioned, by the knowledge of the Lord's perpetual nearness in the sovereign power of His resurrection. Thus the Johannine eschatology may be viewed as a providential transition-point between the fevered dreams of the first sixty years and the long labour of Church history. It forms the bridge by which faith crossed into the centuries in which alone the lessons of time could be acquired. Nor was this "transmuted eschatology," as it has been called, alien to Jesus' own mind. He had shown Himself quite certain that His death would promote the cause of God, that He would approach His disciples after death as the Living One, that a Spirit inseparable from Himself would be amongst them, and that "in the realisation of the Father's good purpose for men He was destined to have a commanding place."

(*b*) If, however, the fundamental truth here is that of a spiritual relationship between Christ and men, involving transcendent saving energies, the conception of the Parousia means also that this relation is to have a climax. The complete and universal triumph of Christ is as sure as His triumph over death. In the New Testament, resurrection and return may almost be called two sides of one fact. The world thinks that Jesus has been disposed of; the Church knows that because He is risen, all will yet be confronted with Him. The Christian prospect is not exhausted in the going of believers to where He is, singly and gradually—a piecemeal draining of life into the next world. There will

be a final manifestation of His supremacy in a mode recognisable by all and exhibiting the last issues of the Divine redemptive rule of all things in heaven and earth. This is an ingrained element of the apostolic faith. The Fourth Evangelist, for all his emphasis on eternal life as an actual possession, recurs as emphatically as the others to a last Advent, for which the Spirit's presence is no substitute, and which is nowhere resolved into purely immanent terms. He transcends the notion of a speedy Return, but he strikes as powerfully as ever the note of a Return at last. The two ideas meet in a single verse. "This is the will of My Father, that every one that beholdeth the Son, and believeth on Him, should have eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day" (vi. 40).

This expectation of the Lord's Return in power and glory will always remain a vital part of Christian belief. It is no primitive fanaticism, but redeeming hope toward God, to expect a real close of history, a worthy *dénouement* for the story of a world in which God has wrought salvation for men. The claim of Jesus to be Saviour is impaired when this is left out. He is not thought of as filled with all power except as we look to Him one day to make His work perfect. Salvation covers more than individual destiny; it is perfected only as the Kingdom is made perfect and Christ's perfecting of the Kingdom, coinciding with the end of this world, is His Advent. How it shall be accomplished, or when, is not our interest either to think or say, but the fact lies at the heart of faith. When we look at Biblical pictures of the End, characterised as they are by the abrogation of spatial relations, allusions to angelic influence, and insistence on mysterious convulsions of nature, we become conscious that the prefigured event lies in a new order of experience, and that to describe it in advance would be to limit the illimitable. Nevertheless, beyond these shadows, it stands

fast that the good purpose of the Father cannot be given full reality in space and time. The Kingdom is transcendent, and only under transcendent conditions—such as are in our minds when we speak of heaven and immortality —does it attain to final being. We speak according to faith in Jesus, therefore, when we affirm that the realisation of the perfect order will be mediated through a final revelation of what He is. He who is now creative and central in redemption will continue to be so when God brings in the world in which the new humanity may dwell.

Conceptions of uniformity and evolution, however, have produced a modern mind which even in many Christian representatives is hostile to all ideas of climax or crisis, whether in the soul or the world. It is held that process is constitutive of all reality which our minds can apprehend, and the apostolic thought of a regenerated universe, implying the transfiguration alike of spirit and of its environment, is put aside as devout poetry. Yet if we start from Christian premises, if we understand what a perfect conclusion from them would involve, it is hard to see how its arrival could be anything else than a genuinely miraculous event. It will not come out of the world; it will come from God. "The second coming," writes Haering, "is not an event within the present course of world-history, but it is its close." [1] Or, to put it otherwise, the final Kingdom is not something which now co-exists with the earthly evolution as the Church triumphant does with the Church militant. It replaces the development it has closed. But this means a transition which can only be described as a miraculous transformation.[2] There may be crisis for the world as conversion or death shows there may be for the single life.

To this there is no alternative but one which promises a

[1] *The Christian Faith*, 901.

[2] Cf. Herrmann, *Communion with God*, 96.

future in which faith cannot rest. Imagine the present order to persist; then, even if sin be destroyed, there will remain everything that we class under the name of accident or calamity. No reason can be thought of why personal holiness should produce a radical alteration in the constitution of the physical universe. It had no such effect in the holiest life ever seen upon the planet. But a world in which pain and death prevail is not what Jesus meant by the Kingdom of God. That is a world in which the Divine omnipotence has free course for the complete expression of Holy Love.

Still further, it must be denied that a society marked by sinlessness or perfect morality can ever be realised on earth.[1] It is not pessimism to say so; it is truthfulness. Apart from all positive transgression, many grave omissions of

[1] It may be asked in astonishment how any one who takes this view of earthly possibilities can believe in social reform. This, it will be noted, is an objection which at bottom assumes that if Jesus really believed in a Parousia, near or distant, His ethics *must* be an *Interimsethik*. Its quality must be affected by His view of the future. For this general contention there is no ground, and we need not delay over it; the morality characteristic of members of the Kingdom is what it is irrespective of all questions how or when the final phase of the Kingdom is to be established. But as regards social reform two things may be said. First, we have Jesus' command to help our brethren, and obedience to this is equally essential whether we do or do not believe that by our help we can give them *complete* happiness. To take the analogy of the individual, shall we say that a Christian is relieved from the obligation to be good because he knows he will never on earth answer to Christ's ideal, "Be ye perfect as your Father in heaven"? But the obligation of social reform is as real as that of personal goodness. All we need know is that it is always in our power to make things a little better. Secondly, it is precisely because we have a Saviour great enough to make things one day utterly good and right that the moral energy necessary for great social tasks is generated in the soul. God would not put us off with a salvation which could be entirely realised in present conditions, and this very conviction is the source of true and useful service. As Haering puts it: "From all external optimism the Church is preserved by her principles: the Kingdom of God will never be perfected on this earth. But faith in the eternal consummation through the full revelation of Jesus Christ should be the greatest stimulus to the utmost exertion of all one's powers for the introduction of a better earthly future" (*The Christian Faith*, p. 909).

duty are occasioned by weakness of the flesh, and it is mere trifling to forget that moral evil consists in what we leave undone as much as in what we do. We are unable to conceive a Christian life on this side of death which had no failure to confess. But life apart from society is an abstraction. And can it be forgotten that what we call a " generation " cannot inherit the goodness of the past except as through discipline and endeavour it makes that goodness its own possession ? The generations, moreover, are not in any rigorous sense successive ; one overlaps the other, and the condition of the world at a given moment is marked by rudimentary moral attainments in large numbers of people as well as by advanced ethical life in some others. The prospect open to humanity, therefore, while existing conditions obtain, is unquestionably that of general spiritual progress, but such a progress as can never in itself, by the addition of *more* of that in which progress has hitherto consisted, lead to a perfect society.[1] In addition, the rejection of an ever higher goodness, by those who do reject it, both implies and causes an ever deeper evil. Hence the attainment of the final goal must take place through the interruption and supersession of the present order ; and while it may be a question whether its arrival is rightly qualified as " abrupt " or " catastrophic," it is at all events something to which no sort of justice is done by the idea of homogeneous con-

[1] It is hard to see why perfection in the society should be looked for from protracted development ; in point of fact, it is not thus attained in the individual. In the case of the individual there comes a climax, named death, which, as Christians hold, gives what can never be given by any development. There is continuity of personal life in and beyond the change, but also there is discontinuity of conditions. Similarly it is permissible to believe that the present phase of the Kingdom may terminate in a sudden crisis of fulfilment. No doubt the anticipation of earthly social perfection is in part due to a false use of the phrase " social organism " ; it being forgotten that " organism " is here only a metaphor, since the self-conscious members of society are perpetually changing and their place being taken by new arrivals.

tinuity. And to this truth Jesus' conception of a Parousia recalls us.

Furthermore, apart from some such *dénouement* the course of human experience as a whole is devoid of ultimate significance. It is not too much to say that the world owes the sense of history to Christian belief in eschatology. Historic reality proper has no place in the Greek or Roman view of things. A writer like Thucydides or Tacitus makes no effort to relate the series of events to any universal end, which all serve as means. Biography, or the life-story of a state or people within a famous period, is done with unrivalled skill, but upon the whole the tide of incident ebbs and flows without adding anything of importance to the meaning of the world or revealing any universal purpose which is more than the process itself.[1] On the other hand, the Hebrew prophets look on to a future in which the will of God is implicated. They stand therefore for the truth that some supreme value attaches to the product of time, and representing as they do the first emergence of the idea of history as such, they are able to form the ethical conception of *Humanity*, moving on, not with aimless feet, but towards a destiny guaranteed by grace. From this time

[1] Greek thought disliked the conception of an absolute or final order, and escaped it by making the movement of the world circular. There are allusions to this in Plato and Aristotle, but its ultimate dependence on a pessimistic view of the universe comes out most plainly in Stoicism. After a reference to Zeno's teaching that in due time the universe would be absorbed in the primal fire, Mr. Bevan proceeds: "He forecast the beginning of another world-process which would follow exactly the same course as the present one, and end, like it, in the one Fire. And so on for ever—for the present process was one of an infinite recurrent series—an everlasting, unvarying round. We may wonder that the human mind has acquiesced in such a view of things, even when we allow for its recoil from the notion of an absolute end; but it has done so, not in Greece only, but in India, and even in modern Europe. Those, however, in modern Europe who have embraced the hypothesis of the Eternal Recurrence have never pretended to regard the world-process as governed by rational purpose" (*Stoics and Sceptics*, 51).

on the race is conceived as a unity, and the ground of unity lies in the plan of God. Thus the eschatology of the New Testament is another name for teleology at its highest power. In the light of Christ's Return, the darkness of pessimism is absorbed.

It is this reference of history and its issues to the purpose of God which alone provides a bond of continuity between present experience and the great future to which faith has always looked. The final summing of all things in Christ, on which Pauline thought rests as an unsurpassable height, suggests to the imagination the coming of a time when creation as a whole will be constituted the serviceable instrument of personality made perfect through fellowship with God, and, in Him, with His people. Nothing will remain in nature, civilisation, or social environment that impedes spiritual life or mutual service. This has been the Divine aim from the first. History, which has had its centre in the work of Jesus, will in closing pass beyond itself into a system of redeemed experience which preserves the fruit of earthly discipline and at last offers room to free and conscious spirit for unhindered self-expression. Everything in this is as ethical as redemption here and now. And perhaps its ethical quality may give us light on the question why the Advent, so passionately hoped for, is delayed. If the Gospel can only be propagated in moral and social ways, if its progress is conditioned by human influence and is relative to the moral attitude of men, the conclusion of the whole cannot be reached in haste, or before the truth in Jesus has been given an opportunity to reveal its inward riches. To this principle, as it seems, we are led by the New Testament prediction that the good news of the Kingdom must be preached throughout the whole world before the end comes—a suggestion underlined by St. Paul when he asks, respecting the eventual conversion of the Jews,

"If their exclusion is the reconciling of the world, what shall their admission be but life from the dead?" (Rom. ii. 15). The thought of redemption as mediated through personal life and enriched by the mutual giving and receiving of all saints, so far from rendering a definite climax otiose, makes it necessary; since the value of the entire movement can only become visible in the light of its culmination.

Thus the final revelation of Christ, who is the key to the history of man, and gives its last meaning to the universe, is necessarily construed in a twofold reference. It looks backward in so far as it consummates the redemptive activity of God; it looks onward in so far as it leads over, by creative transformation, into the perfect order from which all that is recalcitrant to holy love is excluded, and in which disparate and contrary interests, native to the experience of earth, are finally reconciled in or withdrawn from the life of sons of God.

It is a great prospect, so great that only a regenerating faith will dare to mount up to the heights from which it can be seen. According to our sense of what Christ has done will be our answer to the question whether He will yet do more. Believing hope is generated by a Divine presence in the soul. *We through the Spirit by faith wait for the hope of righteousness.*

Christian fancy is apt to play about this theme, not simply or mainly in sense-forms, but in modes taught by the best it has learnt of the Father. It is uplifting to think, for example, that the revelation of Christ in the End may signify a great offer of Divine love to those whose eyes till then have been held. There may be a new and resounding call of the world to God; a convincing disclosure of a Christ hidden before by false doctrine or the disloyal lives of followers; the unreligious doer of duty seeing God and in one instant

made religious because now understanding "whose is the authority which he has been obeying, whose is the strength on which he has been really resting all these years." Upon the very borders of the eternal life, one sight of Jesus as He is may strike dead all doubt, all fear, all reluctance. In such dreams, assuredly, there is no harm. But if it should be so, it will none the less be the Gospel on which men lay hold. Nothing which may transpire to reveal the sweep of salvation as wider than had been known can impair the truth or value of that which has been already told in Jesus the Crucified. All who then respond to Him, if such there be, will respond through moral and spiritual motives.

If in conclusion we ask what has been the best service rendered to Christian life by the anticipation of the Lord's Return, the answer, I think, may be put thus. It has emancipated the mind from purely individual interests, and has gathered believing hopes round the fortunes of the Church. As long as the piety of an age is deep, strong, and fed directly from the New Testament, it will reject the notion that in this region faith is concerned solely with the private destiny of the single life. And the Parousia confirms this instinct, for it is to the redeemed society, not to any single person, that the promise of it has been given. When the Second Advent comes into mind, the proper object of desire and longing is not merely the lot of particular lives, much less our own, but the purpose of God to perfect His Kingdom and glorify His saints.

H. R. Mackintosh.

NEW POINTS OF VIEW IN TEXTUAL CRITICISM.

The textual criticism of the New Testament is on one side almost irredeemably dull, a mere algebra of the combinations of the letters of the various alphabets, handled often by the help of *a priori* assumptions which are incapable of verification by experience; and on the other side it is a study, which is as full of interest and of meaning as Church History itself, to which it properly forms a literary pendant, and without which it often cannot be understood. It has, too, whether from the algebraic or the historical point of view, its own peculiar uncertainties, its own verifications of the law that the unexpected always happens, as for instance when the discovery of some new document upsets the balance of the favourite combinations, or forces the student to recognise that there were important influences operating in the creation of textual variations which he had too hastily assumed could be neglected.

When we try to estimate the direction in which textual criticism has moved in recent times, and in which it is almost certain to move further, we run the risk of being thought reactionary, especially by the junior members of the craft, who are slow to believe that there is anything serious in the suggestion of revolt against the authority of great names on the one hand, and of favourite manuscripts on the other. This is not the place to discuss the question of the future of New Testament criticism over the widest area; but it may be not altogether unprofitable, both to the expert and the non-expert, if we try to recapitulate certain recent results, our own or arrived at by others, which are likely to make a permanent mark upon the history of the science. Let me explain in detail what I mean, and illustrate the argument by chosen examples.

Well, in the first place, there is a revolt against an assumption of Dr. Hort, that there were no traces of dogmatic or heretical depravation in the text of the New Testament. In order to make the matter clear, I shall be obliged to reproduce some quotations which I first made in the Angus lectures for 1908, and which appeared in print in the published volume of those lectures, entitled *Side-Lights on New Testament Research.* For instance, in Dr. Hort's *Introduction* [1] we find the following astonishingly optimistic sentence : " It will not be out of place to add here a distinct expression of our belief that even among the numerous, unquestionably spurious readings of the New Testament there are no signs of deliberate falsification for dogmatic purposes " ! Again : " Accusations of wilful tampering with the text are accordingly not infrequent in Christian antiquity ; but with a single exception (that, namely, of Marcion's mutilation of the text of Luke), wherever they can be verified they prove to be groundless, being in fact hasty and unjust inferences from mere diversities of inherited text."

It is not necessary to make further extracts, though more might be made, from Hort's *Introduction* : the quotations show that Hort believed there were, historically, no heretical manipulations of the text except the famous case of Marcion's Gospel of Luke, and that even for the Marcionite movement, covering, perhaps, at one time, half the Church, and, for a long time, a large part of the known world, there were no signs of Marcionite corruption of the text among the numerous corrupt and rejected readings in the critical apparatus of the New Testament.

In challenging this statement, I selected two cases for study, the first being the Marcionite influence already referred to, which, according to Hort, had made no impression on the text ; the second was the Ebionite movement, with

[1] pp. 282, 283.

its lower Christology, and consequent internal inconsistency with the Scriptures as commonly known to us in the Catholic tradition. I was able to show that the watchwords of Ebionite attack (or, if you please, Ebionite defence) could be found lying round in the New Testament text of the second century; and also that indisputably Marcionite glosses and corrections could be found in some of the greatest manuscripts and versions which have come down to us. At this point, I do not wish to recapitulate the argument for Ebionism in the New Testament: those who wish to examine the matter at length will find it treated briefly in an appendix to the first Angus lecture. As regards Marcion, I should like to point out the evidence on which I was working, because it appears to show that, at a point where Marcion had left his text of Luke uncorrected, his followers had been obliged to go further and add to the mutilations of their leader, which disposes at once of the complacent belief that no one did any harm to the text, as known in surviving documents and evidence, except Marcion.

The students of Church history will recall how Tertullian makes play with Marcion over the sudden appearance of Christ from heaven in one of the Galilean synagogues: and he quotes against Marcion these verses of his own gospel, which correspond to the Lucan statement that our Lord came to Nazareth (or, as Marcion says, to Capernaum) where He had been brought up, and, as His custom was, entered the synagogue on the Sabbath day. Whence, says Tertullian pointedly, could the custom have arisen to a person who had only just arrived? Clearly Tertullian's copy of Marcion's Gospel had enough of the Lucan statement in it to make Marcion look ridiculous. Even if we suppose that Marcion had erased the words about Christ's being brought up at Nazareth (possibly by an omission accompanied by a substitution of Capernaum for Nazareth), he had not erased

the custom of going to the synagogue on the Sabbath Day. A little reflection showed that Marcion's position was insecure from the very start, unless both of the statements referred to above were removed from the text. For if Christ was brought up at Nazareth (or Capernaum) He did not come into the synagogue from heaven; and if He attended the Sabbath service habitually He could not have appeared in the Synagogue suddenly and for the first time.

So I asked the question whether among the existing MSS. and versions of the New Testament there were any traces of an attempt to secure the Marcionite position or to turn the argument of Tertullian. The answer was forthcoming at once: the Codex Bezae and two Latin MSS. of the first rank had erased the word "His" before "custom," so that the Gospel merely said that it was the custom to go to the Synagogue on the Sabbath day, a very simple and ingenious bit of evasion; it was further pointed out that the Codex Bezae had omitted the statement about our Lord's being brought up at Nazareth, and merely says that He came into the Synagogue. Further, the great Codex Palatinus, known by the letter *e* among the Latin MSS. and belonging to the fifth century, has no reference to "the custom" or to "His custom" in coming to the Synagogue, but omits the words entirely. There can be no doubt as to the meaning of this: the codices in question are Marcionised. It would be appropriate to make a catalogue of all the MSS. involved in the corruptions indicated: but let it suffice to prove our point that the MSS. known as D *a c e* all stand convicted. Now what results from this? surely that, over and above the flat contradiction of Hort's untenable assumption about the freedom from heretical depravation of our existing texts, we have also established a new method in textual criticism, which may, perhaps, be crystallised into the following statement: that the history of the text must

be read side by side with the history of the Church, and in the light of the various parties into which the Church was divided.

I should not have made this brief recapitulation of a former argument, if it had not been necessary to break through the silence with which the followers of the dominant school in Textual Criticism are accustomed to meet what is, I hope, a reasonable contention. Even when the points are not actually ignored, they are treated quite insufficiently by those who affect to be our leaders in such matters. Is it nothing to have proved that a group of the greatest manuscripts of the Western text are tainted, and perhaps saturated, with Marcionism ? Yet, as far as I know, the only admission made to my argument as yet, is in a few inadequate lines of Professor Souter,who speaks of the matter in his recently published work, *The Text and Canon of the New Testament.* Observe that what we have proved is something quite apart from the decision as to what Western texts are most closely related to the text of Marcion ; that is something quite different, and does not necessarily attach any stigma to the MSS. that turn out to be nearest neighbours of Marcion. What we establish is that certain MSS. and versions are, in certain passages, deliberately Marcionised. I now pass on to another case of depravation, of greater importance textually, and of equal interest dogmatically.

Some years since I published in the *American Journal of Theology* [1] an article entitled *Did Judas really commit Suicide* ? In this article it was maintained that the expression in the Acts of the Apostles, which describes Judas as *falling headlong* or *falling flat on his face* were the result of a substitution of the words πρηνὴς γενόμενος for an original πρησθείς (or some similar term), according to

[1] *Am. Jour. Th.*, July, 1900.

which primitive reading Judas *swelled up and burst asunder*, after the manner in which the villain of the piece makes his end in some forms of the story of Nadan, the nephew of the sage Aḥiḳar. There was confirmation for this mode of dying in the legends preserved from Papias of the end of the Traitor, who swelled to a huge size and was crushed by a passing carriage. The tendency of the investigation was to relegate the incident to the region of mythology, and perhaps to suggest that the whole Lucan account of the death of Judas may have been interpolated in the text of the first chapter of Acts.

Against this view Dr. Chase wrote an important paper in the *Journal of Theological Studies* [1] in which he maintained that there was no need to amend πρηνὴς γενόμενος into πρησθείς, for the word πρηνής did not necessarily mean the equivalent of the Latin *pronus*, but was itself a medical term derived from a root meaning "to be swollen or inflamed." The statement that Judas *swelled up and burst* should therefore be a part of the existing text of the Acts. and not of any supposed early form of the tradition. As a medical term, it does not necessarily convey the gross form of inflation and crepitation in which those who write of the horrible deaths of traitors and ungodly people may be assumed to delight.

Dr. Chase's argument was not final, as he did not produce an actual instance of the medical term which he postulated ; but his case was strongly supported on linguistic grounds, and Professor Harnack was satisfied that a new word, or a new sense to an old word, had actually been added to the New Testament Lexicon.

This was not all ; for it was natural to say that the expression πρηνὴς γενόμενος, if medical, must also be counted Lucan, in which case the supposition of interpolation

[1] *J.T.S.*, Jan. 1912.

must definitely be abandoned.[1] The confirmations of this view are abundant ; they consist, first of all, in the fondness of Luke for the forms ἐγένετο, γενόμενος, etc., and in the next place, in the fact that he commonly uses the form to describe medical symptoms : the best instance of the latter is in the case of Herod Agrippa I. who is described as γενόμενος σκωληκόβρωτος. The general use of γίνομαι in Luke can easily be verified from the concordance.

Now if Dr. Chase is right, as he seems to be in the main, in his contention that the language of Acts i, 18 is medical and Lucan, we clearly cannot stop the inquiry at this point. The next case to be examined is that of Luke xxii. 43–44, with its significant γενόμενος ἐν ἀγωνίᾳ, and the description of the symptoms of acute suffering which are to be paralleled in medical writers. If these verses are medical and Lucan, what becomes of the theory that they are an interpolation in the text of Luke ? If, however, they are an integral part of the text of Luke, how is it possible that they could have been excised ?

The way to answer these questions is not to begin by quoting manuscript authority for the omission, for, as Dr. Hort would say, knowledge of documents and, we may add, of Church History, should precede final judgment as to readings, but to do as we did in the previous case ; put the textual phenomenon side by side with the Church History of the second century, to which it is agreed that all these varieties belong. Are there, then, any people, or is there any school of thought, to whom the incident that we call the Agony in the Garden would be offensive ? A moment's reflection assures us that to the Docetists, at all events, the narration must have been not only unpalatable, but simply impossible, incredible. For if Christ only suffered

[1] I have explained this more at length in the *American Journal of Theology* for Jan. 1914.

on the Cross and elsewhere in appearance and not in reality, then there can be no Gethsemane. Great drops of blood do not consist with the phantasmal theory of the non-suffering, impassible Logos. Here, then, is the sufficient explanation of the removal of the passage from the early MSS.

But, it will be said, you have the MSS. B R T and ever so many more attesting the omission. Certainly: that is a fact of very great importance. The MSS. in question are all Alexandrian in origin, and Alexandria could not tolerate the Agony in the Garden; it did not agree with their Docetism or with their philosophy; and the attestation of the omission is clearly, overwhelmingly Alexandrian. But, it will be said, Codex B is neutral in its type of text. My good friend, whoever you are, let us leave off talking about Neutral texts: there are no Neutral texts in existence, not even one providentially preserved specimen. When you know Codex B a little better, you will remove its popular label.

So now we have a second school of depravators identified, and with the curious result in modern criticism that certain of our great New Testament scholars are found to be in the net of Docetism!

It will be interesting at this point, in view of the reasonable explanation at which we have arrived for the excision of the section on the Agony, to read Dr. Hort's judgment on the matter.[1]

"Notwithstanding the random suggestions of rash or dishonest handling thrown out by controversialists there is no tangible evidence for the excision of a substantial portion of narrative for doctrinal reasons at any period of textual history. Moreover, except to heretical sects, which exercised no influence over the transmitted texts, the language of the *vv.* 43 f. would be no stumblingblock in the first and second centuries; and to a later time than this it would

[1] *Notes on Select Readings*, p. 64.

be impossible to refer the common original of the documents which attest omission."

The *petitio principii*, that depravation of the text for doctrinal reasons is not to be thought of, runs through the whole of this interesting judgment. We have found for Dr. Hort the heretics whose influence he dared not suspect, and shown that it was absolutely necessary for them to affect the transmitted texts in the way that the MSS. exhibit.

We come now to a much more difficult case to interpret, and one in which the landmarks are, at first, not to be recognised at all. What are we to say of the famous omission of our Lord's prayer for his murderers in Luke xxiii. 34? It is an omission attested by a very early and important group of MSS. (*vide infra*), but, if the method followed in the previous case be a just one, we ought not to begin by asking which among the MSS. omitted the passage, but who are those to whom the words were so offensive that they would wish to excise them. At the first glance, one would say without hesitation that these words can never have provoked the scalpel of any heretic, and that any school of Christian thought would feel itself to be spiritually and historically pauperised by their removal. We need not, therefore, wonder that Dr. Hort expressed himself strongly on the point.

Introd., Notes on Select Readings, p. 68. "Its omission, on the hypothesis of its genuineness, cannot be explained in any reasonable manner. Wilful excision, on account of the love and forgiveness shown to the Lord's own murderers, is absolutely incredible: no various reading in the New Testament gives evidence of having arisen from any such cause."

The language is strong, and it contains the usual untenable assumption that the text of the New Testament has not been subject to depravation; but it is not much stronger than

might have been expected from any one who was mainly influenced by the strength of the testimony for the omission, and who supposed that he had exhausted the evidence on the subject. Are we so certain, however, that we have got to the bottom of the matter? To begin with, who are the murderers in question for whom Christ prayed? The answer of the early Church will be that they are Jews. Is it possible, then, that there could be any persons or any group of persons in the early Church so anti-Judaic as to wish that Christ had not prayed for the Jews, or so wilful and so wicked in their opposition to Judaism as to excise from the Gospel the record of divinest charity? Obviously, if we are to answer that query we must know more about the early Church; we must test it for anti-Judaism, which does not lie on the surface in the same way as Marcionism or Docetism. We do not find a great deal of hostility to Judaism in the New Testament. St. Paul, for example, is on the side of the Jews for the most part: we have an occasional outbreak, as when he charges the Jews (in his first epistle to the Thessalonians)[1] with having killed the Lord Jesus as well as their own prophets, and as being in opposition to everybody; and as when he affirms the wrath to have come upon them to the uttermost. This was a not unnatural judgment, in view of the hostility which the Jews had shown to him in the Macedonian campaign. Sometimes, too, he uses hard words of them, as in the epistle to the Philippians,[2] where he coins a word for them and calls them Concision (refusing to allow the term Circumcision to them, much as the Anglicans reserve for themselves the title of Catholics), and when he exhorts his followers to avoid them in the same way as they would avoid the most grossly immoral persons.

[1] 1 Thess. ii. 14.
[2] Phil. iii. 2.

In the Galatians,[1] there is again a strain of strong language, no doubt provoked by the intrusion of Judaisers into the churches which he had founded; and here also he refuses communion with the Jews on the Scriptural ground that the bondwoman and her son are to be cast out; clearly this means that there is to be no more Church fellowship with the Synagogue. It is the language of removal, of alienation, of renunciation: and it seems clear that St. Paul's passionate expressions of devotion to the salvation of his own race were quite consistent with, and almost necessarily involved, an opposite polarity and an ecclesiastical stringency.

Probably the same exclusion of Jews and Judaisers is implied in Hebrews xiii. 10, where those who serve the sanctuary are explained as not having gone outside the gate in the reproach of Christ.

It is when we come to the end of the first century that we find how strongly anti-Judaism has affected the Churches. The Gospel of John, for example, always speaks of the Jews as a remote people from the author, engaged in long-drawn-out hostility to Jesus. Even their feasts are not His feasts: the passover itself becomes a feast of the Jews: even the innocent customs as to washings before table are called the purifications of the Jews, and are quite outside the writer's own experience. Every one who reads the Fourth Gospel carefully notes these things, but not every one recognises what they imply as to an anti-Judaic polarisation of the Churches of Asia. The same story is told in other documents of the same time: the Gospel of Peter fastens the guilt of the Jews upon them by the remark that when Pilate protestingly washed his hands, none of the Jews shared in the ablution: the teaching of the Apostles shows the Church instituting new fast-days in order that they may not practise

[1] Gal. iv. 30.

a religious rite along with the Jews, who are now described as "the hypocrites." "Let not your fasts be with the hypocrites!" "Do not pray as the hypocrites." Here the renunciation of communion with the Jews (for it would be quite unnatural to interpret hypocrites here as Pharisees) is pronounced and decided, and we see incidentally that Catholic practice has arisen in an Anti-Judaic medium.

When we come to the Apology of Aristides, we have not merely a statement that the Jews are a deicide people, but the statement is a part of the creed itself: "He was pierced by the Jews," says the formula: and just as in the previous case, the Catholic formula must be held to have emerged from an anti-Judaic form, or at least to have passed through such a form. Before we come to the rule that "He was crucified under Pontius Pilate," we have the simpler announcement, in which the responsibility is more definitely assigned: so that with the anti-Judaic hostility expressed in broken fellowship and religious elongation we have the Symbol of the Faith itself in evidence for the temper which we have been studying. As to the temper itself, every student of Church History knows how it shows itself in the story of the part which the Jews took in the death of Polycarp; and it may fairly be assumed that, unless such a state of polarity existed, the extreme form of anti-Judaism which we find in the Marcionite movement would hardly have been possible. There is evidence, then, of a definite and central character, that the confession of some of the churches of the second century was anti-Judaic in type, and that their mode of life was a definite abrenuntiation of Judaism.

Let us go a little further afield and see whether we can find further traces of the same sentiments; those authorities whom we have been quoting are all dated within certain narrow limits, but there are other documents more or less apocryphal and more difficult to date, which tell the same

tale. For instance, Mr. Hoskier draws my attention to the documents of the Church of Edessa. There seems to be little doubt that Christianity in Edessa started among the Jews, and that the early community was Judæo-Christian in character and ideas. It will be more remarkable if we find evidence of a rupture with the Jews in the Edessan Church, and of definite hostility to Judaism on the part of the Christians. In the *Doctrine of Addai* [1] we find Addai saying that the Jews crucified Jesus almost in the language of the creed of Aristides: "for he is the God *of the Jews who crucified Him*, and the erring Gentiles also worship Him though they know it not." King Abgar [2] wishes to go to Palestine and slay the Jews, *because they had crucified Christ*, and being afraid to do this on account of possible political complications, he writes to Tiberius and tells him "*the Jews* . . . who dwell in the country of Palestine, assembled themselves together and *crucified the Christ*," and he suggests to Tiberius to take the matter of the punishment of the Jews in hand. Tiberius replies that Pilate (whom Abgar does not mention) has been disgraced *for having done the will of the Jews*. As soon as Tiberius has a favourable opportunity, "he sent and slew some of the chiefs of the Jews, who were in Palestine. And Abgar the king greatly rejoiced when he heard it, that the Jews had received punishment, as was right!"

No doubt this is all legend and apocrypha, but it is none the less valuable evidence as to what the Edessa writer of the story thought on the subject. He, at least, was anti-Judaic through and through. In the same document, when Addai the Apostle makes his last discourse to the Edessans, he says, [3] "*Take heed*, therefore, *of those that crucified, that*

[1] Ed. Phillips, p. 28.
[2] Ib. p. 36.
[3] Ib. p. 41.

ye be not friends to them, that ye be not responsible with them whose hands are full of the blood of Christ " : which is about as definite an abrenuntiation, as if they had been told that the friendship of the world was enmity with God. The people accept the injunction and promise [1] that from the worship of " things created which our fathers worshipped, we flee, and *with the Jews, the crucifiers, we will not mix ourselves* " ; where the Jews are renounced along with the idols ! Is it not a natural suggestion that the Christian abrenuntiations of the devil, which we know in the early baptismal ceremonies, are modified from even earlier abrenuntiations of idolatry and Judaism ?

A similar state of feeling is betrayed in the Syriac *Didascalia Apostolorum*,[2] where there is a series of commandments given by Addai the Apostle, among which will be found the following excommunication of any Church teacher who fraternises with the Jews : " The apostles have also decreed that he who loves the Jews, like Iscariot who loved them, or the heathen who worship the creatures instead of the Creator, shall not enter among them nor serve ; or if he be among them, they shall not allow him, but he shall be separated from them and shall not serve with them."

Here again the Jews are placed with the pagans, and a decree of excommunication protects the church from any fellowship with them.

In the Syriac *Teaching of the Apostles* published by Cureton [3] we have the story of an interview between the Apostles and the leaders of the Jews (Gamaliel, Nicodemus, etc.) ; the Apostles appeal to them as follows :

" Do not by reason of the shame and fear of men forfeit

[1] Ib. p. 45.

[2] Ed. Gibson, p. 20.

[3] *Syriac Documents relating to the Church of Edessa*, p. 31 (I am again indebted to Mr. Hoskier for the reference.)

your salvation before God, nor have the blood of Christ required of you: even as your fathers, who took it upon them: for *it is not acceptable before God,* that while ye are of one mind with His worshippers, *ye should go to associate with the murderers of His adorable Son.*"

This is as clear a demand for abrenuntiation of Judaism as can be imagined: and those to whom the appeal is made take it in that sense, and reply: "We confess and believe in Christ who was crucified, and we confess that He is from everlasting the Son of God; *and those who dared to crucify Him do we renounce.*"

Here the abrenuntiation is associated with the fundamental Christian confession.

We get the same statement in a very early Syriac writer (this time not a Christian) named Mara Bar Serapion, in whose epistle we find[1] as follows:

"What advantage did the Athenians gain by the murder of Socrates the recompense of which they received in famine and pestilence? Or the people of Samos by the burning of Pythagoras, because in one hour their country was entirely covered with sand?[2] Or the Jews by the death of their wise king, because from that same time their kingdom was taken away?"

In the same volume of Syriac texts from which we have just quoted will be found a portion of what purports to be the lost Apology of Melito of Sardis from the latter part of the second century.[3] Here we find the doctrine that Israel is a deicide people very strongly expressed:

"This is he that was put to death. And where was he put to death? In the midst of Jerusalem. By whom? By Israel. . . . Thou gavest the command and he was

[1] Cureton, *Ancient Syriac Documents*, p. 73.
[2] So the Sibyl: ἔσται καὶ Σίμος ἄμμος.
[3] Ibid. p. 54.

crucified. . . . Thou slewest thy Lord and he was raised on a tree . . . God put to death ; the King of Israel slain by an Israelitish right hand . . . Thou smotest thy Lord."

As it is not quite clear what Melito is the author of this document, I only use it to show how deeply rooted was the conviction in primitive Christianity that the Jewish race were under the ban for the death of Christ. To say that the same belief prevails all over the East to-day adds nothing, however, to the argument.

We have abundant evidence, then, of the wide diffusion of the belief that the Jews were the murderers of the Christ, and therefore excommunicate from every form of Christian fellowship. The difficulty is to determine in what time and in what places the taboo became operative, for it is within such bounds that we must assign the supposed removal of our Lord's prayer on the Cross from the Biblical text.

It may, perhaps, be said that we can carry back the challenge of a verdict for the murder of Christ to the very beginning of the Christian Church. There is plenty of it in the early chapters of the Acts of the Apostles, at all events, whose composition cannot be very late, and whose traditions can hardly diverge far from historical accuracy. It is not a very long step from the position where St. Peter says, with affectionate concern, that " Ye slew the Prince of Life," to the position where Christians say, " With the Jews, the crucifiers, we will have no fellowship." The supposed change in the text of Luke xxiii. 34 may, therefore, have been very early. St Luke might find nothing inconsistent in recording both the Prayer and the Fact : those who came after him emphasised the Fact and erased the Prayer.

We have suggested that the earliest Christian creed contained an anti-Judaic clause. Here is a further curious piece of evidence in the same direction. The famous passage in Josephus concerning Jesus Christ is, to-day, the matter

of renewed dispute as to its authenticity. Whatever may be the final judgement upon the point, one thing seems clear, that the Josephus statement is modelled on a Christian creed : and the creed which underlies it contains a reminiscence of what appears in Aristides' creed as " He was crucified by the Jews." For Josephus (or his pseudo) says :

" *On the accusation of our chief men* Pilate condemned him to the cross . . . he appeared to them (his followers) again alive on the third day."

The sentence concerning the crucifixion is a modification of a previous statement in two directions ; (1) it is not the Jews generally but only our leaders that were responsible ; (2) even in their case the burden begins to be shifted to the shoulders of Pilate.

Whatever be the truth as to the genuineness of the quotation in Josephus, the creed, whether of himself or the interpolator, is an early creed, and shows signs of anti-Judaism in the apologetic turn that the passage takes.

Well ! We have said enough to show what kind of sentiments prevailed in certain Oriental churches with regard to the Jews ; and they are clearly incompatible with the prayer of our Lord on the Cross. It is reasonable, then, to assume, as in the previous case, that the excision of the prayer is polemical. Will it still be said that such a position is impossible, in view of the variety of the documents attesting the omission ? Observe that the united testimony of B and D, flanked by Old Latin and Egyptian versions, is now made stronger by the accession of the Lewis Syriac and probably by the Diatessaron. I admit the strength of the combination ; and that it makes the omission very early : but let us remember that we do not yet know the meaning of these combinations, either chronologically or geographically. They have, in all probability, some historical and geographical meaning : but until we know more of what that meaning

is (as we were able to explain evidence in the Docetist omission of Luke xxii. 43–44 as being Alexandrian) it seems to me to be quite an open question whether the verse Luke xxiii. 34 is not to be allowed to stand. For we have at all events proved anti-Judaic sentiments, in the Asiatic churches, to be very widely prevalent: and if they be prevalent they may very well have operated upon the text at an early date, and so produced the peculiar omission. It will be remembered that the indirect evidence for our Lord's prayer on the Cross is very early, for it is hardly possible to disconnect it from the prayer of St. Stephen, recorded by Luke, and the prayer of St. James the Just, related by Hegesippus. So far as these parallels have any validity, they are at least as ancient as any combination of ancient MSS. can be. It must not, however, be assumed that the prayer on the Cross has its first form and origin in the Canonical Gospel, simply because there are suggestions of extreme antiquity about its tradition. It may, after all, have come into the text of Luke from an uncanonical source, such as the Gospel according to the Hebrews, as I suggested in the Angus lectures, in which case the textual evidence for its omission would have its face-value: all that I am urging at present is a plea for a suspense of judgment, on the ground of the extraordinary evidence which we have brought forward for the existence of an early and violent anti-Judaic polemic: for it is precisely such a polemic as is sufficient to explain the extrusion of the prayer from the text of Luke. If the new hypothesis be considered artificial or insufficiently supported, in the view of unprejudiced people, then we must fall back upon my earlier hypothesis as stated above. In any case, the general argument has been much strengthened for the explanation of striking textual variations by means of corresponding situations in the history of the Church, in which such variations would naturally

and perhaps inevitably arise. So we will leave the matter at present as an incomplete demonstration: the main points of the discourse may be tabulated as follows:—

Character of Error.	*Ecclesiastical Situation in which error arises.*
Ebionite substitutions of "Elect of God" for "Son of God," or conversely.	Such a situation as arises in debate between Jews and Christians, with Justin's *Dialogue with Trypho* for a special case.
Marcionite omissions of references to our Lord's birth and bringing up at Nazareth.	Such a situation as must have arisen in discussion between orthodox Christians and Marcionites, both in Marcion's lifetime and later.
Excision of the Agony in the Garden (which is, however, shown to be both medical and Lucan).	The reason is that the passage would be intolerable to the Docetists, with their phantom, non-suffering Christ.
Excision of the Prayer on the Cross.	The excision is suggested to have been provoked by anti-Judaic polemic, arising very early in the history of the Church, and involving an actual abrenuntiation of all fellowship with the Jews.

Of these four cases of depravation, the last appears to be chronologically the earliest, but they may all four, probably, be referred to the first half of the second century.

J. Rendel Harris.

NOTES ON THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

VI. The Interview with Nicodemus (iii. 1–2).

In this narrative there are two issues quite subordinate for our present purpose and one of primary importance: (1) Nicodemus has often been regarded as an individual anxious inquirer; but Jesus does not treat him with the gentleness that in such a case we might expect; and He addresses him as representing a class, while Nicodemus passes from condescension to incredulity. It is probable that Nicodemus was sent by a section of the Pharisaic party, who, as religious leaders of the people, felt their influence imperilled by the growing popularity of the new Teacher, and thought it might be for their advantage to come, if practicable, to some sort of understanding and alliance with Him. Jesus sternly rejects the proferred patronage, and severely demands an entire change of attitude as the first condition of understanding or taking part in the movement. As He had tested the Sadducees by the cleansing of the temple, so He tested the Pharisees by the demand for the new birth, or the birth of water and the Spirit; and both parties failed to stand the test, even as the people failed to offer the belief which He desired.

(2) If our exegesis is to be at all historical, we cannot find in Jesus' words about the new birth, or the birth of water and the Spirit, any allusion to the ecclesiastical dogma of regeneration, to the Christian ordinance of baptism, or to the Christian experience of the descent of the Spirit at Pentecost. For Jesus was not speaking to Nicodemus in riddles. His reference was to the baptism of repentance John administered, and the gift of the Spirit which John announced as the Messiah's prerogative. Let the Pharisees come to Him in penitence, and with expectation of blessing,

and they would both see and enter into the kingdom. The teaching here is in no way in truth at variance with, although in terms it may be different from the Synoptic ; and in this interview with Nicodemus one feels oneself on the solid ground of reminiscence.

(3) But it is generally acknowledged that reminiscence passes soon into reflexion, although there is difference of opinion as regards the exact point of transition. (*a*) The Revised Version begins a new paragraph at verse sixteen, and the writer welcomes the opportunity of quoting so conservative a scholar as Westcott in support of this view.

" This section," he says, " is a commentary on the nature of the mission of the Son, which has been indicated in Christ's words (*vv.* 13, 14), and unfolds its design (16, 17), its historic completion (18, 19), the cause of its apparent failure (20, 21). It adds no new thoughts, but brings out the force of the revelation already given in outline (1–15) by the light of Christian experience. It is therefore likely from its secondary character, apart from all other considerations, that it contains the reflections of the Evangelist, and is not a continuation of the words of the Lord. This conclusion appears to be firmly established from details of expression " (*Gospel of St. John*, p. 54). The case need not be argued further. (*b*) The writer is convinced, however, that the narrative of the interview with Nicodemus does not extend to verse fifteen. Is it at all likely that Jesus would have spoken to Nicodemus about His heavenly descent, or His heavenward ascent by way of the Cross and the Resurrection, when He even with His disciples exercised such reserve of utterance ? There seems no doubt that at least verses thirteen to fifteen must be excluded from the story of the meeting with Nicodemus. But are they to be at once reckoned to the evangelist's reflexions ? To use Westcott's phrase, " details of expression " bar this hasty judgment. The Son of Man is a

term used of Himself in the Gospels by Jesus only; the evangelist speaks of the Son as the Son of God (*vv.* 17, 18). If Jesus did speak of pre-existence at all, it is not improbable that He described the entrance into the world as a descent from heaven. "Many ancient authorities omit *which is in heaven*" (R.V. marg.), and, whatever may be the balance of the textual evidence, if we are to accept the saying at all as an authentic utterance of Jesus, these words must manifestly be rejected as a gloss, as they are entirely inconsistent with Jesus' conception of His earthly life as relatively a separation from His Father, and His death and resurrection as a return to His Father (John xiv. 12, 28; xvi. 5–7, etc.). The descent is contrasted with the ascent in the lifting up. And the whole thought is quite congruous to the other teaching of Jesus. It bears a resemblance in idea to the saying in i. 51. We may conclude that here we have a genuine *logion* of Jesus, but belonging to another context, at a later stage of the ministry, which has been attracted to this place by association of ideas with the reference in the preceding verse to the earthly and heavenly things. (*c*) Do verses eleven and twelve belong to the story of the meeting? The question in verse ten would form a deserved dismissal of Nicodemus. It is true that the plural is used in verse seven, so that Nicodemus is treated as representative of a class; but in verses 3, 5, 7, 10, the singular is used. Accordingly, these verses in their whole tone, as well as mode of address, seem more appropriate to a public discourse than to an individual interview. If without any irreverence the illustration may be used, we may recall Queen Victoria's complaint that Mr. Gladstone addressed her as if she were a public meeting. A similar incongruity seems to obtrude itself here. That the words are authentic utterances of Jesus need not be doubted, only by an association of ideas not hard to discover they have been attracted

here from some other context. We may summarise the results of our inquiry thus : the interview with Nicodemus is reported in verses 1–10 ; sayings of Jesus from another context have been attracted by an association of ideas in verses 11–15 ; the evangelist offers his comments on his report in verses 16–21. This is one of the most helpful passages for the study of the mode of composition of the Fourth Gospel.

(4) Accordingly, at this point we may digress from the detailed discussion to a general statement as to the way in which we may correctly represent the growth of the Gospel. (*a*) It has already been suggested, and reasons have been offered for the suggestion, that the Gospel is a scholar's report of the teaching of the evangelist. Either in a small band of disciples, or in the public assembly of the Christian community, the evangelist dealt with the life and teaching of Jesus. He began with an account of events or report of discourses, just as the modern preacher starts with his text ; and then he went on to comment on what he had reported. We cannot throughout the Gospel analyse this teaching or preaching into its components, as we have been able to do in this passage, but we may assume a similar process of composition even where the analysis cannot be made so distinctly and confidently. It is quite probable that neither the hearer nor even the speaker was aware of the passage from reminiscence to reflexion. The scholar reporting his teacher would feel no need for indicating the points of transition ; and his conscience would not trouble him for thus blending, or, as the modern critic conscious of his own integrity would possibly say, confusing history and doctrine. So much in extenuation of the reporter's offence, if offence it be ; what of the evangelist himself ? (*b*) We may conceive the process in his mind as follows : He had not merely a retentive memory, but also an active intelligence ; he meditated on

what he remembered; and so gradually, inevitably, and insensibly reflexions attached themselves to, or even modified reminiscences. A non-thinking person is more likely to retain the *ipsissima verba* of a remembered conversation than a thoughtful one; the more active the intelligence, the stronger the influence of meditation on recollection. It is quite credible that when preaching or teaching the evangelist could not always have distinguished the original germ of reminiscence from the subsequent development of reflexion. (*c*) Would he have made the attempt or felt any obligation to make it? He was not a modern scholar, aiming at historical accuracy, but an ancient teacher, conscious of the guidance into all the truth of the Spirit of God, promised by the Master. His reflexions would be to him as much part of the given revelation as His reminiscence. He would confidently claim with Paul that he had the mind of Christ. And great as for us is the significance of the earthly life of Jesus, can we confine the divine revelation through Him to His spoken words alone? We must include the experience of His truth and grace through the Spirit, which has been given to seers and saints. The value of the revelation of Christ in the evangelist is fully tested by the influence the Fourth Gospel has exercised on Christians of all lands and ages. If we may make a comparison, we may confidently affirm that it has probably been more of a spiritual treasure than any of the others have been. We can recover, if not with absolute certainty, yet with adequate accuracy, the history, and we can retain the theology as a valid interpretation of the history of the Word who became flesh.

VII. The Second Testimony of the Baptist (iii. 22–36).

This section requires only a few words. The interview with Nicodemus shows that the need of penitence as a pre-

paration for the blessings of the kingdom had not been adequately recognised ; and it is probable that Jesus did at first continue the work of His forerunner, although the actual baptizing may have been done by the disciples. It is also probable that the success of Jesus in attracting the multitudes would arouse the jealousy of those disciples of John, who had not left him for Jesus. Whether his second testimony is given *verbatim*, or has been a little coloured by the channel of its transmission, the mind of the evangelist, there is nothing in his words inconsistent with what we know of him from the other sources. For a former disciple of the Baptist, the renewed witness to Jesus would be of special interest ; and his former associates may have been ready to convey it to him. The Revised Version in the division of the paragraphs recognises that at verse 31 the reflexions of the evangelist begin, and both as regards the thought and the language there seems to be no doubt as to the necessity of that conclusion. The Baptist's testimony to the superiority of the Christ, and his consequent greater success, naturally suggests these reflexions on the greater value of the witness of Him Who has descended from heaven than of any earth-born. While the thoughts are the evangelist's, they are rooted in and draw their nourishment from the truth as it is in Jesus ; the self-witness of the Son is their source and warrant.

VIII. The Journey Through Samaria (iv. 1–42).

(1) The narrative of the journey through Samaria bears all the marks of verisimilitude. If it is not a record of fact, it is a masterpiece of literary realism. The conversation moves from point to point naturally. The great truth about the universal spiritual worship of God (*vv.* 21 and 23) arises in the mind, and falls from the lips of Jesus almost inevitably in the reaction of His spirit against the religious exclu-

siveness of the woman (and it may be, of His own disciples, who may have expressed some hesitation about taking this route to Galilee, to which, though shorter, some very strict Jews took exception). The declaration in verse 22 is not an instance of Jewish exclusiveness, but an appeal to the woman to recognise the inferiority of her own religious standpoint, of which she was so confident, so that she might be prepared to receive the instruction which Jesus, whom she had repelled as a Jew, desired to impart to her. Since the woman, with her countrymen, thought of the Messiah as the "Converter" or the "Guide," and did not, at the time at least, seem to cherish the political expectations of the Jews, Jesus could reveal Himself to her as the Messiah without fear of the political complications that such an avowal would have involved in Judæa and Galilee. Josephus does tell us (*Ant.* xviii. 4, 1) of a subsequent Messianic insurrection on Mount Gerizim ; but that fact does not prove that the conditions were the same at the earlier and the later date.

The way in which the narrative passes from one circumstance to another as determining Jesus' spirit and action shows that a ministry in Samaria was as remote from His purpose as a mission to the Gentiles, not, as the words here (confirmed elsewhere) show, because of Jewish exclusiveness, but because He was dominated by the consciousness of His vocation as the Jewish Messiah, through the fulfilment of which alone He could reach forth to the wider function of the Saviour of the world. Accordingly, He does not embrace the opportunity which Samaria offered, but leaves it to His disciples to enter afterwards into the harvest of which His ministry now was the seed-sowing (*see* Acts viii.). Ready as had been the response to the Samaritans, Jesus had the insight to perceive that the soil was not so well-prepared for the seed of the Word as in Judæa or Galilee among those who were waiting for the consolation of Israel.

The historical probability lends support to the trustworthiness of the record before us.

(2) There are, however, a few points demanding explanation. (*a*) As Jesus was alone with the woman, the record of the conversation may have come to the evangelist either from Jesus, or from the woman ; or it may be the evangelist included parts of the story the woman was so eagerly telling in the instruction Jesus Himself repeated to His disciples as the explanation of His unusual action, and its still more surprising results. In verse eighteen there is a statement which raises a difficulty. Moral and spiritual insight, however exceptional, does not include the knowledge of a fact such as that the woman had had five husbands. Jesus was doubtless aware, as He spoke to her, of her moral degradation, and the discomfort that on account of it she may in His presence have been feeling, since her frank confession, " I have no husband," shows that her conscience had been stirred ; but the ability to know how often she had been divorced does not seem to fall within the scope of His supernatural endowment. Possibly the evangelist, having afterwards learned the fact from the woman herself may have quite unconsciously, under the influence of his tendency to emphasise the supernaturalness of Jesus' knowledge, repeated this later information as part of Jesus' own speech to her. Or, more probably, the woman herself in her excitement may have failed to distinguish what Jesus said, and what her own conscience spoke in His presence. His words in verse twenty-nine show that she thought Jesus had laid bare all the secrets of her life. (*b*) While verses twenty-one and twenty-three, as also twenty-two, arise spontaneously from the context, the more abstract statement in verse twenty-four, which does not add anything to the substance of Jesus' teaching, may be a reflexion of the evangelist's. Further, the title *the Saviour of the World* used by the Samari-

tans (verse 42) goes beyond anything that the previous record has prepared for us, and may well reflect the faith of a later age and not of this historical occasion.

IX. The Second Visit to Cana (iv. 43–54).

(1) This passage calls for little comment. (*a*) Does verse forty-four mean that Jesus Himself quoted the proverb, "A prophet hath no honour in his own country," as a reason for leaving Judæa, and going to Galilee, or did Jesus' action in the judgment of the evangelist in so doing confirm the truth of the proverb? In other words, are we to interpret the proverb from the standpoint of Jesus or the evangelist? If from the former, the conclusion would be inevitable that Jesus meant by His own country Galilee, but that would be a reason for leaving Galilee, and not for returning to it; and so the saying would not suit the context. If from the latter, then the proverb reveals the evangelist's conviction that as Jewish Messiah Jesus, wherever His early home may have been, properly belonged to Judæa; and this intensified the tragedy of His having to turn from Judæa to Galilee. A parallel thought is in i. 11: "He came unto His own place (*τὰ ἴδια*) and His own people (*οἱ ἴδιοι*) received Him not." Does not this standpoint suggest a Judæan rather than a Galilæan author? (*b*) There is no need of assuming that the story in verses 46–54 is a variant tradition of the healing of the nobleman's son (Matt. viii. 5–13= Luke vii. 2–10), as all the details are so different; nor is there any ground for the suggestion that the evangelist is exaggerating the supernaturalness of the cure by representing it as at a distance. If Jesus wrought His miracles in dependence on God, if not always with explicit prayer to God (xi. 41–42), His bodily presence or absence does not affect at all the credibility of the narrative. It is acsuredly the modern scholar's standpoint, and not the evangelist's, for

which the one kind of cure would appear more miraculous than the other. (*c*) The answer of Jesus to the request (verse 48) suggests that He was unwilling to repeat in Galilee the kind of ministry which had proved so fruitless in Judæa, the working of miracles which evoked an untrustworthy belief. If we now turn to Mark i. 14 for the continuation of the story after verse 54 in this chapter, we may infer that Jesus' plan was to avoid the working of miracles as far as possible, and to undertake with a few chosen companions a preaching tour in the synagogues of Galilee. For this work the two pairs of brothers were first called, and then Matthew.

(2) We may at this point ask, if John the son of Zebedee was the beloved disciple (the fourth evangelist), and accordingly had been with Jesus in Jerusalem and Samaria, an eyewitness of the ministry there, and had come back to Cana on this second visit, how is it that he was only now called (Mark i. 19–20) from his fishing and his home to follow Jesus and become a fisher of men? Is it not much more probable that one of several Judæan disciples went with Jesus to Cana in Galilee, and remained with Him as long as his companionship was needed; but, when the Galilæan disciples had been called to help in the work of Galilee, returned to his own home to continue the work begun in Galilee, and rejoined the Master only when He came up at the feasts to Jerusalem? (*a*) It is to be noted that while "disciples" are mentioned in chapters two, three and four, no names at all are given, and it is only in chapter vi., when we are in Galilee that the familiar names, Philip, Andrew, Simon Peter (of chapter one) occur. If that fact does not warrant us in confidently asserting that these "disciples" did not include any of the twelve, it forbids our confidently assuming, as is usually done, that they must have been some of the twelve. It is possible that all these were Judæan disciples, who afterwards, except one, fell from their faith, or at least shrank

back from continued companionship, and that the one "faithful among the faithless" in lovingkindness and tender mercy made no mention of their names. Let these suggestions not be dismissed as rash conjectures; for the call as recorded in the Synoptists is unintelligible if it was addressed to men who had for months been close companions. The truth is that we have formed our conception of the disciple company from the Synoptic records, and when we come to the Fourth Gospel we assume without any warrant in the narrative itself, and contrary to the plain meaning of the Synoptic story of the call, that the disciples there mentioned must be some of the twelve.

(2) (*b*) To maintain the historical accuracy of both the Johannine and the Synoptic records, it seems to me necessary to venture on the following historical reconstruction. The ministry of the Baptist had attracted the Galilæans mentioned in chapter i. By their contact with Jesus they had been won to a measure of faith in Him sufficient to detach them from the Baptist, and to attach them to Him. The unnamed disciple was the evangelist. Other disciples there may have been brought in the same way; but these only are mentioned by name because they were afterwards included in the chosen company of the twelve. This first call was to a less constant companionship than the call recorded in the Synoptics. While it is probable that all these men were included in the company who went with Jesus to the marriage at Cana (ii. 2), it is possible that the Galilæans went to their homes. It is to be observed that while "His disciples" are mentioned as going down with Jesus to Capernaum (verse 12), where we meet the two pairs of brothers in the beginning of the Synoptic story, only Jesus is mentioned as going up to Jerusalem for the passover (verse 13). Must the phrase "They abode not many days" necessarily include Andrew and Peter (Philip, Nathanael),

and must they too necessarily be included in "the disciples" mentioned in verses 17 and 22? Is it not possible that they remained in Capernaum, and only rejoined Jesus when called to constant companionship, as recorded in Mark i. 16–20? During this interval of time, between the first visit to Capernaum (John ii. 12) and the second (Mark i. 14) the evangelist and other Judæan disciples alone may have been Jesus' companions, and may have left them when He decided on Galilee as the scene of His further ministry. Does not this help to explain what otherwise is so inexplicable, on the one hand the silence of Mark (with Peter as his teacher) regarding the early Judæan ministry, and on the other the silence of the Fourth Gospel regarding most of the Galilæan ministry, and its almost exclusive attention to work in Judea?

ALFRED E. GARVIE.

CONDUCT AND THE KINGDOM

IN these modern times, when the presentation to the mind of striking alternatives as regards contrasted or complementary aspects of New Testament doctrine has become familiar, there seems to have grown fashionable—especially abroad—an exaggerated tendency to look upon the teaching of Jesus recorded by the evangelists as *either* eschatological *or* ethical. It is the purpose of this paper to demonstrate that in a far greater number of references than is generally realised the ethical significance is dominant; in other words, the eschatological idea is spiritualised, and new content is given to popular apocalyptic forms of expression by the introduction direct or indirect of moral conditions.

"The Gospel of the Kingdom," as we may call it with the first age of the Christian Church (Matt. iv. 23), constituted the main theme of the teaching of our Lord. Its purport was wholly, or almost wholly, eschatological—

in the sense of relating to the close of the present age, as well as to the emergence of the new era of blessedness.

It will be profitable to realise first of all how large a number of the passages in question convey the teaching that the enjoyment of the expected Kingdom is conditional on character.

Although the doctrine of the earlier prophets of Israel concerning "the day of Yahweh" was profoundly ethical, yet the need for personal change is but occasionally traceable in the pseudepigraphical writings current before the dawn of Christianity, and so the teaching which our Lord promulgated was virtually novel to His hearers. It is also a remarkable fact that every reference from the lips of Jesus to the resurrection of men and to eternal life contains in some or all reports the enunciation or implication of an ethical condition. Various aspects of this moral fitness appear in different passages, but a very comprehensive conception of individual endeavour as a prerequisite for sharing the blessed life is obtained from them when they are gathered together.

Let us survey the references to the Kingdom of God (or "of the heavens"). We discover that more than one-third of the direct allusions imply the condition of certain characteristics being forthcoming in such as would enjoy its privileges in their fulness.

To those who regarded themselves as "sons of the kingdom" by right of birth and observance of legal requirements, such manifold expression of conditions spiritual and moral must have come with startling novelty and disconcerting insistence.

1. Personal Qualifications.

We will review at the outset the phases of what we may term inward change and individual endeavour which are

demanded of the would-be citizens of the Kingdom of God. The rule in the hearts of men, the effectual consciousness of divine sonship, must be first acknowledged.

(*a*) In the very forefront of the transformed religious life, as well as chronologically first in the Gospel records, stands *Repentance*, always coupled explicitly or by implication with *Faith*.

This, according to the Matthaean summary (iii. 2), had been already demanded by John the Baptist in his preliminary proclamation of the Kingdom that was to be. It was needed for the inward moral revolution which was sealed by water-baptism, which was itself selective and symbolic, anticipatory of the penitent's entrance into the Kingdom through the Messianic fire-baptism of judgment.

In like manner in our Lord's teaching repentance was the prerequisite for the passing of the individual from the cold life of law to that ardent serving life of love which fitted him for the spiritual kingdom, entered through the portal of divine forgiveness, when God should rule in earthly manifestation of glory and power willingly obedient and filial hearts.

If the statement of the first evangelist be correct, Jesus took up and carried on the burden of the Baptist's cry, while He proceeded to deepen and spiritualise it: "Repent ye, and believe" the glad-tidings of the Kingdom of God which is nigh (Mark i. 15||). Although "glad-tidings" probably represents a later view of the initial message, yet it expresses well the advance from a proclamation of stern warning to one of hope, from a message of fear to one of love, from the terror of divine wrath to the pleading invitation to heavenly blessedness.

Nor does this urgent appeal for repentance reiterated by our Lord appear to have awakened any effectual echo in the hearts of the religious leaders of the people; so that far on in

the ministry, probably in the closing week—as tradition places it—Jesus looked back upon a continuous invitation to the coming Kingdom which had failed to attract the ruler, the legalist, the cultured from their serene self-righteousness of rigorous observances, and told them in burning words of sad disillusionment, sorrowful reflexion and yearning love: "the publicans and the harlots"—outcast and sinful, worse even than the ignorant "people of the land"—"go into the kingdom of God before you"; thus vividly depicting as present the entering of the ideal Kingdom in the renewed world. Nay more, just these persons of commanding influence in the nation had failed to take advantage of the penitence and faith which those despised classes had exhibited at the first in consequence of the heart-searching utterances of the preacher in the wilderness, even before His own more positive and gladdening appeal (Matt. xxi. 31 f.; cf. iii. 7).

Much that links the respective doctrine of the two proclaimers of the Kingdom lies behind the record of a retrospect such as this, and the fruitful penitence of the social outcasts is confirmed by the brief summary of the results of the Forerunner's preaching in our Lord's encomium: "all the people . . . and the publicans, justified God, being baptized with the baptism of John" (Luke vii. 29; cf. iii. 12).

It appears unnecessary to labour this essential of change of heart, which is so clear a ground-tone of the Lord's teaching, and emerges in its solitary simplicity on the human side in an appealing story of divine grace like the parable of the Prodigal Son. The Lucan record affords other specimens of our Lord's doctrine of repentance, although they are not directly connected with the thought of the Kingdom. Events of common discussion among the Passover crowds at Jerusalem, like the slaughter of the Galileans,

or the accident at Siloam, are utilized as stimuli to penitence (xiii. 1 ff.), while it is shown parabolically that the experience of life supplies ample opportunity for change of heart (6 ff.), without the need of any "miraculous" appeal (xvi. 30).

(*b*) After taking note of this initial and fundamental qualification of repentance combined with and in consequence of belief in the Gospel of the Kingdom we may well survey in some detail those characteristics demanded from the sincere recipient of the message which imply positive effort before those in which a negative aspect of religious behaviour is involved.

The attitude of *Seeking* claims mention at the beginning of the list of necessary qualities, because it expresses well the eager earnestness of the faithful. The Father's Kingdom is to be the primary objective of a man's life: "Seek ye (first) his kingdom (and his righteousness)" (Matt. vi. 33; cf. Luke xii. 31), and this personal endeavour is really identical with the zealous striving to attain the requisite character which God demands, whether we assume the fuller Matthaean form to be original or not. Luke appends (32) a further encouragement that the "little flock" of such seekers are assured of the "Father's good pleasure to give" them the Kingdom. We are reminded of the long-suffering and righteous "sheep" to whom the residue would submit (Enoch xc. 30), and also of the quiet pious souls who "looked for the redemption of Jerusalem" (Luke ii. 38).

(*c*) Very closely related to this primary essential mark of those to whom the eschatological boon is thus made certain is one which, in order to distinguish it, we may designate *Sincerity*, singleness of purpose; and this is also regarded by our Lord as being absolutely necessary: "no man, having put his hand to the plough, and looking

back, is fit for the kingdom of God" (Luke ix. 62). Although the time is undefined, the agent is evidently not yet in the Kingdom, but his activity—self-fitting, preaching the good news to others, or whatever it may be—is preparatory for its advent.

With this may be associated singleness of eye, so that the moral aim may be unhindered by a distorted view (Matt. vi. 22, Luke xi. 34).

Some would probably add to these phases of directive energy the spirit of the stormer: "men of violence take" or "enter" the Kingdom "by force" (Matt. xi. 12, Luke xvi. 16); but it is extremely difficult to attain certainty as to the exact original meaning of this saying. Taken literally as advice on our Lord's part it would be unique; for He always deprecated the use of force, political or physical, in hastening the desired consummation of the Kingdom.

It would seem better, assuming some such words to have been reported from Jesus with approximate accuracy, to regard them as expressing either commendation of spiritual ardour in prayer (cf. Mark xi. 23 ff.‖, Luke xvii. 6) and effort, or, if uttered in a tone of deprecation, as intended to check unreal and fanatically disposed adherents. If the colouring be later, as the form of the Lucan record might suggest, the saying might have been utilised as significant of the rush of would-be converts into the Church.

(*d*) In contradistinction to the spirit which would besiege Heaven and attempt to hasten the manifestation of the Kingdom by material means (cf. the Temptation narratives), the most striking, and, to His contemporaries, most revolutionary, feature is the prominence accorded in the eschatological teaching of our Lord to the disposition of *Childlikeness* as an essential condition.

In the sweet and familiar picture of His "suffering the little children to come unto" Him we are told that He

said: "of such is the Kingdom of God" (Mark x. 14‖). Those who would be fit for its glorious and happy citizenship must exhibit not indeed the weakness, ignorance and inexperience which are associated with childhood, but its instinctive confidence and open simplicity, its dependent trustfulness and responsive affection. The relationship of the little one to the parent in the home is a dim representation, an earthly foreshadowing, of the ideal relationship between the human child and the heavenly Father whose is the Kingdom. That this quality of character is imperative for individual acceptance is emphasised in the subsequent solemn statement: "Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall in no wise enter therein" (15).

But to the disciples apparently such teaching was not new. For, although by reason of the similarity of the subject sayings from the one story would be easily transferable to the other—if we accept provisionally the Marcan order of the scenes and do not reckon them as doublets—on a previous occasion in the home at Capernaum Jesus had openly rebuked the unseemly dispute as to precedence upon which His intimate friends had entered "in the way" by a memorable parable in action (Mark ix. 36 f., Matt. xviii. 2 ff., Luke ix. 47 f.). Some, in order to particularise, have vividly imagined it to be Peter's child taken into the Master's arms in his own house, when Jesus—if this connexion be original—makes the young one typical of the bearers of the message of the Kingdom in His name: "Whosoever shall receive one of such little children in my name, receiveth me: and whosoever receiveth me, receiveth not me, but him that sent me." The glad welcome of the child-like disciple is represented as ultimately a receiving of the Father, and thus is in its turn a mark of fitness for the Kingdom. This application, or perhaps rather conversion,

of an authentic saying illustrates the ease of the confusion of "little ones" literally with little ones signifying humble disciples or believers (42, Matt. xviii. 6, x. 42; cf. Luke xvii. 2). The pointing of the lesson which Luke appends (ix. 48c) lays stress on the aspect of humility, which is prominent in this Gospel, alike in parable (xvii. 7 ff., xviii. 14) and saying (xvii. 11, xvi. 15).

Matthew's version of the earlier scene contains additional words so eminently suitable to the occasion and to the action that they possess an intrinsic claim to authenticity, and he does not need to repeat the saying about the manner of reception after the account (xix. 14) of the bringing of the young children: "except ye turn, and become as little children, ye shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven" (xviii. 3); while the immediate lesson is obviously and naturally deduced in view of the previous dispute concerning position—which Matthew, however, avoided recording as being detrimental to the character of the apostles: "Whosoever therefore shall humble himself as this little child, the same is the greater in the kingdom of heaven" (4). Thus "lowliness majestic" is essential.

Another fragmentary saying which emphasises the acceptable quality of the child is inserted in the first gospel after the warning against "occasions of stumbling" to "little ones who believe on me" (Mark, Matt.): "their (sc. the little ones') angels do always behold the face of my Father who is in heaven" (xviii. 10). We may compare with this the stern imagery of the millstone as the fit end for such offenders (Luke xvii. 1 f.). To those who are like the afore-mentioned children figuratively, untrained folk, babes in legal culture, the divine revelation is accorded (Matt. xi. 25). And upon childlike humble trust the door of the Kingdom will not be shut (xxiii. 13); but it is the chooser of the lowly couch that will be exalted (12),

(*e*) Just as the anger of a child passes quickly like a shower on a summer's day, so is his temperament rapidly forgiving. We are thus led on in thought to another necessary characteristic, *Forgiveness*, or more strictly as a quality, Forgivingness, urged as essential in our Lord's teaching concerning the coming Kingdom both directly and indirectly. It is enjoined expressly in the pattern prayer and in the alternative which is appended thereto: "Forgive us our debts (sins), as we also have forgiven (forgive) our debtors (every one that is indebted to us) . . . For if ye forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father will also forgive you. But if ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your Father forgive your trespasses" (Matt. vi. 12, 14 f., Luke xi. 4).

The divine forgiveness of sin is the primary spiritual requirement, stimulating thankful love in return (cf. Luke vii. 41 ff.), and therefore the fulfilment of the condition for obtaining it stands in the forefront of human duty. In more senses than one forgiveness is the portal of the Kingdom.

Indirectly, it is enjoined in response to Peter's inquiry as to the frequency of pardon by means of the parable of the Unmerciful Slave, with its conclusion, which is incapable of misconception: "so also shall my heavenly Father do unto you, if ye forgive not every one his brother from your hearts" (Matt. xviii. 21–35). Luke, on the other hand, records a similar behest of pardon for the penitent brother in a different context (xvii. 3 f.).

The Kingdom of God, for which forgiveness is a prerequisite trait, is indeed unmentioned by name in these passages, but the time referred to is indubitably that of the advent thereof in its fulness for which the faithful followers of Jesus were to pray (vi. 10), a coming which is regarded as coincident with divine judgment for weal or woe (xviii. 23).

Evidently those who would "enter the kingdom" must be "both forgivers and forgiven."

(*f*) Another ethical and practical feature of the Lord's doctrine of the Kingdom as an eschatological objective, relative to the period before its glorious manifestation, consists in the fact that, although this divine boon is "of free grace" and not "of debt," yet *Labour*, not idle expectancy, is the responsible duty of each would-be member thereof. Not only is this illustrated by the truth that even the disciples were called when following their daily avocations, and their toil, far from being stopped, was merely transformed into the service of "the gospel of the kingdom," but also "the Gospel of Work" constitutes the lesson of the indirect teaching of a special parable, that of the Labourers in the Vineyard (Matt. xx. 1–16). Even supposing that the acute controversies about Gentile privilege may have had some little influence on the exact form in which the story has been transmitted, the main lesson remains unaffected; and it is this: that all are summoned to labour before the heavenly reward of the Kingdom is imparted, and that all who respond to the call with sincerity and earnestness are equals in recompense. Nevertheless the earthly similitude is seen to be strictly inadequate for the completeness of the teaching, in that the boon of God's good pleasure is really out of all proportion to the work accomplished, whether during a period long or short, and is the same for all who have fulfilled the conditions of service which the divine employer imposes.

Similar teaching of the necessity for continuous and trustworthy service is inculcated in the related parables of the Talents (xxv. 14 ff.) and the Pounds (Luke xix. 12 ff.). The duty of work for the disciple, irrespective of outward profit or gratitude, is also enjoined in the little story of the Obedient Slave (Luke xvii. 7 ff.). We might note too that the

similitude of the Two Sons (Matt. xxi. 28 ff.) indirectly emphasises the fact that the toil which fits for the Kingdom is genuine and devoted service, practice and not merely profession "Doing the will" and "keeping the word of God" signify the same conduct in its exercise (Matt. vii. 21; cf. Mark iii. 35 ||, Luke xi. 28).

(*g*) But the close of the present working-time is unknown to the labourers in the loving service of the Kingdom whether corporately or individually: much stress, therefore, is laid in our Lord's parabolic teaching upon *Preparedness* for the sudden and unexpected manifestation of the glorious reign of God, be the delay long or short; and even Jesus apparently looked for that advent "in power" during the lifetime of "some" at any rate of His hearers, if, indeed, this restriction be authentic (Mark ix. 1, etc.). This state of preparedness is an essential condition for the expectant citizen, and may be viewed in one of two ways, either as (i) Watchfulness, or as (ii) Readiness.

(i) The urgent necessity of watchfulness is inculcated in the following stories—whether they are definitely introduced in the tradition as similitudes of the Kingdom or not—from the closing phases of the ministry: the likeness of the Master and the Thief (Matt. xxiv. 43, Luke xii. 39; cf. the preceding Christianised warning in Matt. 42), and also that of the Snare (Luke xxi. 34 ff.), as well as the larger parable of the Wise and Foolish Virgins (Matt. xxv. 1–13), in which watchfulness—at least in intention—and readiness are combined by those who gain admission to the marriage feast.

(ii) The aspect of readiness as a necessary qualification is brought out more especially in such a story as that which demands the conscious assumption of the befitting "wedding-garment," which is apparently conflated in Matthew (xxii. 11 ff.) with another parable, that of the crown-prince's

marriage feast (2–14), which tells rather of the active acceptance of the invitation (cf. Luke xiv. 17–24).

Readiness is also the lesson of the various Slave similitudes, wherein the respective duties are diligently executed despite the master's delay in returning ; and solemn warning is afforded by the doom of the unready and unreliable (Matt. xxiv. 45 ff., Luke xii. 37 f.).

In the parables of the Talents and of the Pounds (Matt xxv. 14. ff., Luke xix. 12 ff.) the state of readiness consists in the slaves' constant and effective employment of that which is entrusted to them, regardless of the time when the reckoning will take place. Thus once more the interval of delay is found to be a period for earnest labour whose reward is a higher sphere of service, while in each case the deprivation of further opportunity for service, virtually self-inflicted in the case of some of the slaves, strikes a powerful and far-echoing note of admonition. Stories of this type are applicable also to an indefinite waiting-time before the " appearing " of the Kingdom, and of such the latter of the aforementioned is illustrative according to the Lucan introduction thereto (xix. 11).

(*h*) Now there is another qualification, closely cognate to the initial attitude of Seeking, which is not frequently emphasised simply because it is assumed from Jewish religious custom to be habitual, and that is *Prayerfulness.* " When ye pray," says our Lord (Matt. vi. 5) ; but it is the prayer " in secret " that may expect recompense in the Kingdom (6), whose advent is the chief object of desire (10), while all hypocrisy in practice is condemned (5), and—whether this section were originally connected or not—errors in its exercise are corrected (7). The prime subject for supplication is hereby realised to be the coming of the divine reign on earth ; and such would be included in the " common prayer " which is encouraged (xviii. 19 f.).

Luke indeed records in close proximity to the Lord's Prayer (xi. 2 ff.) the parable of the Importunate Friend as illustrative of the beneficial effects of persistent petition even amongst men, and the perfect and loving response of the heavenly Father is more "sure and certain" (5 ff.).

Furthermore, although the waiting-time for the dismayed disciples may seem long, perseverance in prayer is vividly enjoined in this gospel also by the story of the Unjust Judge (xviii. 1 ff.), and the humble and penitent temperament of the sincerely prayerful is brought out with an inimitable restraint of words in the succeeding parable of the Pharisee and the Publican (10 ff.). The inter-relation of unwavering faith with prayer is well exhibited in the sayings traditionally attached to the Fig-tree story (Mark xi. 22 ff., Matt. xxi. 22), although unrecorded in Luke (cf. xvii. 6). Yet in his gospel our Lord's own example emerges most clearly (ix. 18, 28 f., etc.).

(*i*) There are discoverable, on the other hand, in the eschatological teaching of our Lord what we may designate negative aspects of fitness for the Kingdom. Of these *Self-denial* or self-sacrifice—in the fullest sense of God first, then others' good, and self last—is especially prominent. The following of Jesus may involve the abandonment for His sake of all that men hold dear on earth, but life in the Kingdom, "eternal life in the world to come" for the sake of which (Luke) the loss has been suffered, is assured (Mark x. 29 f.‖).

According to the teaching—which seems, however, to have been worked over—given to the crowd together with the disciples (Mark) just after the confession of Peter, loyalty is likely to include in its exercise "bearing the cross" and even "losing of life" for the Master's sake, which is identical with the cause of the Kingdom; but the suffering experienced finds its recompense in the divine judg-

ment through the Son of Man's witness to His own genuine adherents (Mark viii. 34 ff., Matt. xvi. 24 ff., Luke ix. 23 ff.). The same doctrine of self-denying loyalty to Jesus reappears in doublet form in the conflated address to "the twelve" (Matt. x. 38 f.), and a recension of the second portion is found also as an illustrative addition in the Lucan apocalyptic section (xvii. 33), while we meet with the first part again—once more in connexion with divisions in the family consequent on the profession of the new faith—in a slightly heightened form; the non-bearer of the cross and non-follower "cannot be my disciple" (Luke xiv. 27; cf. 33): loyalty is more than life (26). Moreover, the Fourth Gospel contains an adaptation which is enriched by its application to the death of the Lord or of the disciple (xii. 25).

This utter disregard of self which may be needful is expressed in yet more startling imagery in a saying which is peculiar to Matthew, attached somewhat inharmoniously to the teaching on the subject of divorce, concerning men becoming "eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake"—extraordinary sacrifice for spiritual usefulness (xix. 12). Not unconnected with this is the sundering of family ties which has been alluded to above, a result of declared and active discipleship in the first age and in any newly founded church, forming part of the "cost to be counted" and a phase of "bearing the cross"; and this is illustrated by the similitudes of the builder of a tower and the king contemplating a campaign (Luke xiv. 28 ff.). The teaching on this open-eyed self-sacrifice is represented as having been given to "great multitudes" (25). Such, then, are features of the great renunciation incurred for the cause of the Kingdom and its Proclaimer.

(*j*) Closely related to the foregoing is the condition of *Persecution*, always more or less inseparable from the inevitable contrast with others which loyal preaching and

service of the divine Kingdom produces. Indeed the true followers have to experience, according to the bold metaphor of "the cross" noticed above—whether we assume it to have been used in the Galilean ministry or not—the lot of criminals in their treatment by others, like their Master (Mark viii. 34): their devotion to the transforming tidings of the Kingdom brings no smooth life. But the persecution spoken of, according to the instructions to the first apostles—whether coloured by subsequent experience or not—is passive, something to be endured. There is nothing fanatically fomented about it; as we may gather from the fact that it is not to be sought by provocation, by undue persistence (Mark vi. 11‖; cf. Luke x. 11) or needless delay (Matt. x. 23). Some authentic injunctions must lie behind such recurrent teaching.

And yet the persecuted are "happy," and the boon of the Kingdom in some way already realised will have its consummation: they are also, as the expansion of the beatitude declares, continuing a glorious and historic line (Matt. v. 10 ff., Luke vi. 22 f.). The form of this persecuting in the first age is outlined in the eschatological chapter (Mark xiii. 9 ff.‖), and the details have quite likely been influenced by what the Christians endured at the hands of their foes, whether within Palestine or beyond its borders. Nevertheless, according to the Lucan tradition, this fellow-suffering of the first disciples with their Lord rendered them fit for the Kingdom, and indeed for some definite share of authority therein (xxii. 29 f.; cf. Matt. xix. 28) as well.

2. Personal Activities.

(*A*) *The Higher Righteousness.*

We have surveyed the main personal qualifications which, although they are nowhere set forth systematically, emerge

from the fragmentary records of our Lord's doctrine in connexion with the Kingdom; but some broad issues and far-reaching and transforming effects of these qualities in exercise severally or conjointly remain to be estimated.

The urgent need of individual religious conduct of higher value and wider present efficacy than mere legal righteousness and the claim of Jewish birth for admission into the ideal and blessed citizenship is shown in the frequent parabolic allusions to the excluding of the unfit. Even "the sons of the Kingdom," inheritors as they deemed themselves to be of the coming age by the prescriptive right of a covenant people, "shall be cast forth," as our Lord states in that utterance which is appended, in Matthew's order, to the narrative of the centurion's manifestation of a faith which was beyond all expectation (Matt. viii. 12; cf. Luke xiii. 28). The same is implied in the similitude of the narrow way, or gate, or door, which affords access to the Kingdom of God (Matt. vii. 13 f., Luke xiii. 24 ff.), and also by the admonitory parables of the concluding portion of our Lord's ministry: the Marriage Feast (Matt. xxii. 1 ff.), the Ten Virgins (xxv. 1 ff.), and so forth.

The necessity for this new righteousness, to which reference has just been made, deserves to rank as a demand which finds its fulfilment in the very exercise of those qualities which have been already reviewed, qualities which are primarily inward in origin, issuing "out of the heart of man" (cf. Matt. xii. 34, xxiii. 25 f., Luke xi. 39 ff.) in the requisite character and consequent conduct, rather than external in the sense of being associated with submission to legal ordinances of rite and ceremony.

They are necessarily social as well as individual; for they inevitably affect the relationship of a man to his neighbour, and render it more definitely a religious matter in view of the approaching Kingdom.

Apart from the general tendency, the resultant of the ethical forces represented by these qualities, there are utterances which inculcate this transfigured righteousness in clear terms, such as must have wrought a revolutionary re-estimating of current religious values. "I say unto you, except your righteousness shall exceed (that) of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven" (Matt. v. 20): this was assuredly a revaluing of religion in the accepted sense; it exalted "the spirit" above "the letter," principle above detail, and directed supreme attention to the ethical factor in the treatment of the requirements for and characteristics of the life which was essential here and now for admission to the divine Kingdom, quite apart from the "when" of its full manifestation. The solemn warning which closes this fundamental teaching concerning those who desired to become in very truth "sons of the kingdom" only serves to emphasise afresh the insufficiency of mere profession and the immense importance of holiness which springs from within (cf. vii. 21). It is the doer, the one who puts into practice the words of Jesus, that is prepared for any emergency, and is likened at the close of the common Sermon material to the builder "upon the rock" (Matt. vii. 24 f., Luke vi. 47 f.).

It is not surprising, therefore, that the scribe who grasped this fact, that the inward motive issuing in a life-character was of far greater import than ceremonial observance, was commended by the Lord with the words: "Thou art not far from the kingdom of God" (Mark xii. 34): he was approaching that higher type of righteousness which the Father demanded of all those who sought to enter the Kingdom, who indeed might be regarded ideally as already its present sharers (Matt. v. 3, 10). Moreover, whether we accept it as authentic or not, we may refer to the pictorial

language concluding the interpretation which Matthew gives of the parable of the Tares, seeing that it is at any rate harmonious with our Lord's constant teaching that righteousness constitutes an essential condition for inclusion in the Kingdom, the righteousness of the penitent and love-impelled strivers: "Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father" (xiii. 43).

(*B*) *The Wider Love.*

Another effect of the dominance of these spiritual and moral qualities, and of the development of Godlikeness, the filial disposition, calls for notice. If the teaching of our Lord with regard to preconditions which are essential to fitness for the future Kingdom may be treated on the one side as a call to a transfigured righteousness in the present, whether the interval before the divine consummation which was assured were long or short, on the other side it involved a demand, implicit as well as explicit, for placing the altruistic qualities in the forefront through the relations between man and man here and now, for the exercise of love in the highest sense, as the reply to the scribe quoted above demonstrated. The obtaining of "mercy" at "the day of the great judgment," which is the initial factor in the blessedness of the Kingdom, is promised to those who are themselves "merciful," who manifest the divine quality of forgiving love in daily exercise (Matt. v. 6). And this love must be directed outward to enemies private, social and national, so that herein lies the germ of a universal as opposed to a merely Jewish Gospel (Matt. v. 43 ff., Luke vi. 27 f.).

The closely connected enunciation of the passive principle of non-resistance, replacing the law of retaliation, clothed as it is in startling Oriental imagery (Matt. 38 ff., Luke 29), has received disproportionate attention and has aroused

prolonged controversy, instead of stress being duly laid upon the active principle of love which underlies the positive counsel, which comes to expression in prayer for the persecuting foe, and, looking for no return, is alone of irresistible potency and itself characteristic of divine sonship (Luke 35). It is in the light of the Father's Kingdom that the realisation of brotherhood necessitates the exercise of love, for without it there can be no effective spiritual relationship to God. Love of God *and* one's neighbour constitutes the fulfilment of "the law and the prophets" (Matt. xxii. 37 ff.; cf. Mark xii. 30 f., Luke x. 27 f.), and it is illustrated in Luke by the story of the good Samaritan (30 ff.).

Furthermore, the dictum concerning "a cup of (cold) water" (Mark ix. 41, Matt. x. 42), whatever may have been its original form and scope, was destined to have far-reaching humanitarian effects.

Serving love, too, is represented as one at least of the principles of judgment and so of admission into the blessed divinely-ruled community, according to the vivid picture of separation which follows the similitude of the Sheep and the Goats, and forms therewith the solemn close of the final group of Matthaean parables of judgment (xxv. 34 ff.). Those who manifest it are blessed of the Father, and for them "the (pre-existing) kingdom is prepared" (34).

The permanent validity of the teaching is not affected by our uncertainty as to the exact form of the story originally, seeing that, whoever be the objects of judgment intended in the first instance, Christ-like conduct, typified here by ministering love, is represented as constituting the sole test applied.

In conclusion of a straightforward and unembellished review of the personal qualities and activities, which emerge as ethical and spiritual essentials from our Lord's eschato-

logical teaching connected directly or indirectly with the advent of the Kingdom of God, we may remark that, although here and there in the Jewish pseudepigraphical writings are to be discovered traces of the requirement of moral qualities for "the life of the world to come," the collecting together of the fragments recorded of the doctrine of Jesus on this subject demonstrates it to have been in its totality little less than novel and revolutionary to His hearers. Despite its roots in Old Testament prophecy it was virtually a new wine which the old skins of traditional ethics could not contain; it was indeed "a new teaching." The form was eschatological, the imagery sometimes ancient and apocalyptic, but the content, just because it was spiritual and ethical, was and is found to be both universal and permanent in its validity.

EDWARD WILLIAM WINSTANLEY.

THE CALL OF GOD.

ONE of the most profitable ways in which we can study Vocation is to know the man to whom a call has come, and to find out, if he lets us so far into his heart, how it came to him. Where the call of God is heard by a man with any measure of obedience, there can seldom be for long any great doubt as to the history of it. Sometimes he will tell the story himself, vividly, and directly, as Isaiah tells how he "saw the Lord sitting on a throne, high and lifted up, and his train filled the temple." But that is not the whole story, for if we ask who was this man to whom this vision came, and why should he have had it rather than any one else, we are involved in a good many questions. If we can find the answers to them, we shall be in a position better to understand how God deals with men—how historically He has dealt with men; and when we understand that, we

may find that He has had dealings with us ourselves, the significance of which we did not see.

It is perhaps rather a risky thing to enter on such inquiries when one is dependent on a translation and is not at home in the vernacular spoken by the man we study. But I begin to think that a foreign speech is never fully mastered, however long one reads it;—do we know our own? And again, when a thought reaches a certain elevation, it may lose something in translation—a great deal perhaps—and yet reveal a great soul in awful simplicity. "And His will is our peace"—that is, even in a foreign prose, a thought of power and wonder, and it speaks, for those who will hear, of a spiritual experience of no common kind. Without Italian, we shall not know Dante to the full; but we can know something worth while of the greater sort of man from even a very little of him. One of Shakespeare's most famous women speaks thirty lines only in the course of the play. So, if we recognise that we are to lose something, we may also fairly claim that we do not lose all, when we read so living a man as Jeremiah in a translation.

He tells us a little about himself and his antecedents; he was "the son of Hilkiah, of the priests that were in Anathoth in the land of Benjamin" (i. 1), a member by birth of a priestly caste, which does not always imply much religion; and the episode of his purchase of land (ch. xxxii.) seems to suggest that he was a man of property. He further tells us (xvi. 2) that he did not marry. The rest of his story must be gathered from the things of which he speaks and the way in which he speaks of them.

It has been remarked of our Lord and St. Paul, that it is plain from their speech that the one was country-bred and the other a man of municipalities—"a citizen of no mean city," he says himself. The same contrast would appear to hold between Jeremiah and Ezekiel. Similes

from nature are frequent in all literature, but there are differences in the way in which men use them. Our Lord always confined Himself to the real and the actual, and so does Jeremiah; and there is a certain likeness in their use of country things and country ways, though Jeremiah does not employ the parable-form with anything approaching the supremacy we find in the Gospels. But contrast him with Ezekiel. The eagle, with great wings and long pinions, full of feathers, which comes to Lebanon and carries off the topmost of the young twigs of a cedar and sets it in a city of merchants in a land of traffic (Ezek. xvii. 2–8),—the other cedar, under whose shadow "dwelt all nations" (Ezek. xxxi. 6),—and the lioness with the wonderful whelps (Ezek. xix. 1–9), leave nature a long way behind; and we are perhaps right in thinking that men who have lived close to nature take fewer liberties with her. Jeremiah's references to country life, to the farm, the animals wild and tame, the daily round of labours and anxieties, and the wonder and beauty of nature, surely have something to tell us of a sentient spirit, for whom all these things were familiar and were dear. The examples of our Lord, of Virgil, and Wordsworth, and Tennyson, prompt the thought that Jeremiah's instinctive recurrence to country scenes and doings whenever he wishes an illustration that will reach the heart and make the matter clear and living, points to boyhood and its impressions.

It is wonderful how many sides of country life he touches —perhaps he would have been surprised to be told it himself. There is the vineyard, with the "noble vine, wholly a right seed," and "the degenerate plant of a strange vine" (ii. 21),—the grape-gatherer (vi. 9) who "leaves some gleaning grapes" (xlix. 9),—the risks of the thief in the night, when the crop is ripe (xlix. 9), and the "keepers of the field round about" (iv. 17). There is the olive; and here we may pause to note a certain deliberate use of the adjective,

not idle at all, which suggests feeling and gives a hint of the man's style—" a green olive tree, fair with goodly fruit " (xi. 16)—and we may compare the question " where is the flock, that was given thee, thy beautiful flock ? " (xiii. 20). There is the corn-field of course. " What is the straw to the wheat ? saith the Lord " (xxiii. 28). That is not quite the Lord's dialect when He speaks with the city-bred. One of his most haunting phrases turns on harvest—" The harvest is past, the summer is ended, and we are not saved " (viii. 20). After harvest the preparations begin for next year and new cattle are broken in—Ephraim, he says, is " chastised, as a calf unaccustomed to the yoke " (xxxi. 18).

As the boy grows, he ranges further afield—with the fowler after the birds—" they watch," he says of the wicked, " as fowlers lie in wait ; they set a trap, they catch men " (v. 26). He studies the birds—" the stork in the heaven knoweth her appointed times ; and the turtle and the swallow and the crane observe the time of their coming " (viii. 7), and the partridge (xvii. 11) and the eagle with its nest in the clefts of the rock (xlix. 16) come under his observation. Or perhaps he wandered with the shepherds —stretched the tent with them and set up the curtains (x. 20 ; vi. 3) ; and later on he looked back to the desert life and wished he could have it again (ix. 2). He told the flocks with them (xxxiii. 13), sought with them the scattered sheep (l. 17), and grew into acquaintance with the wild beasts—" he shall come up like a lion from the pride of Jordan . . . Who is the shepherd that will stand before me ? . . . Surely they shall drag them away, even the little ones of the flock " (xlix. 19–20). Sometimes the tables were turned, and the shepherds took the young lions—" they shall roar together like young lions ; they shall growl as lions' whelps " (li. 38). The jackal (li. 37), the leopard (xiii, 23) and the wild ass (ii. 24), we can believe, had

all their interest, and the wildest and most dangerous of all the desert-dwellers no less—"by the ways hast thou sat for them, as an Arab in the wilderness" (iii. 2).

But apart from the living creatures, the common face of nature spoke to him, rememberable things. There is the great drought—"because of the ground which is chapt, for that no rain hath been in the land, the plowmen are ashamed, they cover their heads. Yea, the hind also in the field calveth and forsaketh her young, because there is no grass. And the wild asses stand on the bare heights, they pant for air like jackals; their eyes fail, because there is no herbage" (xiv. 4–6.) That passage shows the man—the keen observation, the memory, the short quick telling phrase, and the picture, alive with truth and imagination. There is the "hot wind from the bare heights in the wilderness" (iv. 11), and in telling contrast we read: "Shall the snow of Lebanon fail from the rock of the field? or shall the cold waters that flow down from afar be dried up?" (xviii. 14). "Are there any among the vanities of the heathen that can cause rain? or can the heavens give showers? art not Thou He, O Lord our God?" (xiv. 22). There is the constant and familiar mystery of day and night—"my covenant of the day, and my covenant of the night" (xxxiii. 20)—"the shadows of the evening are stretched out" (vi. 4) and "the host of heaven that cannot be numbered" (xxxiii. 22) rise over the boy in the shepherds' camp, and the sense for God grows. Then back into the village to watch the potter busy at his wheel (xviii. 1–4), and the metal-worker (x. 4, 9) and the bellows blowing fiercely (vi. 29). It is, in short, a boyhood like Wordsworth's in close touch with objects that endure.

From what has been said, it will take little insight to deduce a meditative temperament. There is a reflective cast about him from the start, tinged with melancholy.

He is given to introspection and life with many moods lacks ease. Popular talk has exaggerated—grossly—his weeping and his tears. His contemporaries saw another Jeremiah—" a man of strife and a man of contention to the whole earth " (xv. 10). He turns things over and over—" Thy words were found and I did eat them ; and thy words were unto me a joy and the rejoicing of mine heart : for I am called by thy name, O Lord God of hosts. I sat not in the assembly of them that make merry, nor rejoiced. I sat alone because of thy hand ; for thou hast filled me with indignation " (xv. 16, 17). He looks into his own heart—" pained at my very heart ; my heart is disquieted within me " (iv. 19),—and, like other men who look within, he is shocked and troubled at what he finds, for " the heart is deceitful above all things, and it is desperately sick ; who can know it ? " and he answers, only God (xvii. 9). " O Lord, I know that the way of man is not in himself : it is not in man that walketh to direct his steps. O Lord, correct me " (x. 23, 24). As he grew to know better the life of his people—the hopelessness of effort to help or guide them—the inevitable doom descending on them, which he was to share—it is easy to understand how melancholy grew upon him (viii. 18 ; ix. 1), how " the sword reached to the soul " (iv. 10), and how he wished he had never been born (xx. 14) ; but even before all this, the seeds of disquiet were with him. One trait in his character is the extraordinary frankness with which, deeply pious as he is, he challenges God to explain Himself—" Righteous art thou, O Lord, when I plead with thee : yet I would reason the cause with thee : wherefore doth the way of the wicked prosper ? wherefore are all they at ease that deal very treacherously ? " (xii. 1). The sensitive nature, coming gradually into the knowledge of the badness and rottenness of human character and human life, suffers acutely ; the times are out of joint—

there is so much to explain, and to endure ; and the prophet (not yet at all conscious of any prophetic gifts or call) cannot explain and cannot bear, for he has not in himself the power to do either. Such a man, as he sees later on, is not the type needed for a prophet, yet God calls him, and we after the event see why. It is the sensitive nature, for which things are unendurable and unintelligible, that sees and reads the problem true. He, of all men, has the best chance to know, for he feels the irreconcilable elements that other men miss, and cannot rest with them in a peace that is no peace.

This then is our man, but now we reach a place where there is a gap in our story. With this type it is never easy to know where and when they become conscious of God—even when they tell us. For God is with them, and as they go they have, in George Fox's phrase, "great openings." Things stand out in a new way—they see—and all before seems dim by comparison. This happens again and again. When further, as in the case of Jeremiah, we depend on a book notoriously confused and uncertain in text and order, a book about the writing of which we can never pronounce definitely how much the prophet wrote or Baruch or others, we cannot get very far with a narrative. But we find sooner or later a man with an unspeakable consciousness of God. "Am I a God at hand, saith the Lord, and not a God afar off ? Can any hide in the secret places that I shall not see him ? saith the Lord. Do not I fill heaven and earth ? saith the Lord " (xxiii. 23, 24). God, near and far, and filling all things—it is the knowledge of all the mystics. How can there be other gods ? "The Lord is the true God ; he is the living God, and an everlasting king . . . Thus shall ye say unto them, the gods that have not made the heavens and the earth, these shall perish from the earth, and from under the heavens. He hath made the earth by his power

he hath established the world by his wisdom, and by his understanding hath he stretched out the heavens" (x. 10–12). And yet the prophet's people neither see nor feel. "Hath a nation changed their gods, which yet are no gods? but my people have changed their glory for that which doth not profit. Be astonished, O ye heavens, at this, and be horribly afraid, be ye very desolate, saith the Lord" (ii. 11, 12), for over these very heavens God's people have set another. "Seest thou not what they do in the cities of Judah and in the streets of Jerusalem? The children gather wood, and the fathers kindle the fire, and the women knead the dough, to make cakes to the queen of heaven" (vii. 17, 18). Thus from childhood the minds of his people were being steeped in falsity, and years after in Egypt the women said that so long as they had burnt incense to the queen of heaven, they had "plenty of victuals, and were well, and saw no evil," and things had gone wrong since they left off. There were other renunciations of God, too—"for according to the number of thy cities are thy gods, O Judah; and according to the number of the streets of Jerusalem have ye set up altars to the shameful thing, even altars to burn incense unto Baal" (xi. 13). Here we have the beginning of the call—in the dreadful contrast between God and No-gods, between the prophet's sense of God's nearness and wonder, and the people who turned their back to God, and not their face (ii. 27).

The prophet looked out on the world around; the vision of God does not dull the eyes of understanding. No, with keener gaze he looked and he saw other nations—armies and kings and great powers—danger ever nearer. But no one else saw it. Poor and great alike are under delusion, false to God, false to one another, delusion has come upon them. Their very confidence in God is false. Isaiah had foretold the safety of Jerusalem from Sennacherib; plenty of new

Isaiahs foretold in the same strain her safety from Nebuchadnezzar. It was in vain; God's thoughts were other. "Amend your ways and your doings, and I will cause you to dwell in this place. Trust ye not in lying words, saying, The temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord are these" (vii. 3, 4). The temple had been saved before, this time it would not be. God asked righteousness, but they were satisfied without it. But the place is full of prophets of peace—saying, "I have dreamed, I have dreamed" (xxiii. 25); and "they have healed also the hurt of my people lightly, saying, Peace, peace; when there is no peace" (vi. 14; viii. 11). "The prophets prophesy falsely, and the priests bear rule by their means; and my people love to have it so; and what will ye do in the end thereof?" (v. 31). And God has heard what the prophets have said that prophesy lies in His name (xxiii. 25).

The call comes to a point. The situation grows intolerable—false peace, real danger, rejection of God, rejection by God, capitivity—"and my people love to have it so!" Then Jeremiah hears God speaking, and speaking to him personally. It does not matter whether the conversation took a moment or six months—it came. "Before I formed thee in the belly I knew thee, and before thou camest out of the womb I sanctified thee; I have appointed thee a prophet unto the nations" (i. 5). This is indeed a dreadful outcome of the realization of God—this awful charge. To be a prophet—to quit field and quiet, and speak of God and His judgments to men who will not listen, when one is a man, sensitive, shrinking and uneasy. God must have chosen the wrong man. "Then said I, Ah, Lord God! behold, I cannot speak; for I am a child. But the Lord said unto me, Say not, I am a child: for to whomsoever I shall send thee thou shalt go, and whatsoever I command thee thou shalt speak. Be not afraid because of them: for

I am with thee to deliver thee, saith the Lord. Then the Lord put forth His hand, and touched my mouth, and the Lord said unto me, Behold, I have put my words in thy mouth. . . . Gird up thy loins, and arise and speak unto them all that I command thee: be not dismayed at them, lest I dismay thee before them. For, behold, I have made thee this day a defenced city, and an iron pillar, and brazen walls, against the kings of Judah, against the princes thereof, against the priests thereof, and against the people of the land. And they shall fight against thee; but they shall not prevail against thee; for I am with thee, saith the Lord, to deliver thee."

"Peace, peace," when there was no peace, was the message of the false prophet. Jeremiah's message was to be judgment, the destruction of temple and tower, captivity in a strange land and no speedy return. And when the false prophet promised a short exile, Jeremiah had to write and give his countrymen a strange message from God—to settle down, to marry and multiply, "and seek the peace of the city whither I have caused you to be carried away captive, and pray unto the Lord for it; for in the peace thereof shall ye have peace" (xxix. 6, 7); for they were to be there seventy years. So far every word of God that He puts in Jeremiah's mouth is a word of terror and pain. No man would wish to speak them—least of all such a man. And yet he could not help it. That we learn from the burning utterance that follows the conflict with Pashhur (ch. xx.). "O Lord," cries the prophet after his public exhibition in the stocks, "thou hast beguiled me and I was beguiled; thou art stronger than I, and hast prevailed: I am become a laughing-stock all the day, every one mocketh me. For as often as I speak, I cry out; I cry, Violence and spoil: because the word of the Lord is made a reproach unto me, and a derision, all the day. And if I say, I will not make men-

tion of him, nor speak any more in his name, then there is in mine heart as it were a burning fire, shut up in my bones, and I am weary with forbearing and I cannot contain." Such words need no comment—they are true of every prophet, every poet, every man to whom God speaks; there is nothing for it but to speak what is given, and at last the given word comes out almost of itself.

Even yet we have hardly got the whole of the call, but we have seen certain elements of it—the consciousness of God and the sense of the all-importance of the God-directed life —the contrast offered by the nation's indifference to God, their need of God and their danger—the summons to speak, coupled with reluctance and a deep feeling of unfitness,—the growing burning inevitableness of obedience—and somehow the conviction that God, Who fills earth and heaven, Who picks His man before he is born, must go with His messenger. Pain there will be—endless conflict with the men of his nation, prophet, and priest and king—contumely, stocks and dungeon—and, at last, deportation—a long record of failure. The brazen wall and iron pillar, the man of strife and contention (as they called him), stout, dauntless and impenetrable—they little knew how he quivered and tingled and suffered. The message was a hard one—doubly hard when it had to be given against his own people, when it bore the look of disloyalty and bad patriotism—and he gave it at all costs. And then because he is obedient and risks everything on God, he comes into a still deeper insight into God's nature and God's ways. They have turned the back to God and not the face, though He has sent prophet after prophet. "rising up early and sending them" (vii. 13),—so God is to be frustrate of His purpose? Is He? "Then came the word of the Lord unto Jeremiah, saying, Behold, I am the Lord, the God of all flesh; is there anything too hard for me?" (xxxii. 26, 27). God's message given through

Jeremiah has failed,—not altogether, for there were some who listened and remembered and wrote down his words—but in the main it had failed, and God is beaten? It is early to say that. No, God is not likely to be beaten—hardly that. Then?

By and by, the prophet, despised and rejected along with his God, penetrates farther into the secrets of God. God's love of Israel and God's rejection by Israel meet, as it were (in Bunyan's phrase), in his soul; and which will prove stronger? "The Lord appeared of old unto me, saying, Yea, I have loved thee with an everlasting love" (xxxi. 3). If God's love is on the same scale as His other attributes, it will be as eternal as God Himself; it will in the long run be too much for Israel, and will achieve its purpose. A new Israel, ransomed and redeemed from the hand of him that is stronger than he, shall come back from captivity, "and they shall come and sing in the height of Zion, and shall flow together unto the goodness of the Lord . . . and my people shall be satisfied with my goodness, saith the Lord" (xxxi. 11–14). But it will be a changed Israel, and the change will be an inward one. "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah. . . . I will put my law in their inward parts, and in their heart will I write it; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people; and they shall teach no more every man his neighbour and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord [the sorry task of the prophet himself]: for they shall all know me from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the Lord; for I will forgive their iniquity, and their sin will I remember no more" (xxxi. 31–34). The insight here is amazing—hundreds of years later the infant Christian church saw the meaning of the passage and took it, and gave the name of "New Covenant" to the book that told

the story of God in Christ reconciling the world to Himself. The instinct that seized the quotation was sound ; but how came the thought to Jeremiah ? Surely by obedience to God's call.

God has many ways of calling men, but when side by side we are conscious of the love of God in Christ, with all it means of freedom and peace, and of the darkness of the heathen world, given over to gods that are no-gods, and all they involve of falsity, cruelty and lust—a contrast acuter and more urgent than Jeremiah saw—is it not legitimate to suggest that in such a contrast there lies a call for us also, and that, if we obey, we too shall enter into new knowledge of the love of God and of God's purposes ?

T. R. Glover.

ON TWO POINTS IN 1 TIMOTHY I.

In the Expositor for November 1913 appeared a new translation, by Professor A. Souter, of St. Paul's two Epistles to Timothy. In a prefatory note the translator expresses the hope that " the precise meaning of certain passages is now made clearer than has hitherto been the case in an English rendering."

It is not the object of the present paper to offer a general criticism of Professor Souter's translation of the Pastoral Epistles, but to direct attention to two points which, as it seems to me, have been missed by him in his rendering of 1 Timothy i.

I will take first *vv.* 11 and 12, in which the kindred words ἐπιστεύθην and πιστόν occur. The logical connexion between the two verses is lost entirely unless in the translation the idea common to these two words is clearly brought out.

Let us begin by quoting the original Greek :—

κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς δόξης τοῦ μακαρίου θεοῦ, ὃ ἐπιστεύθην ἐγώ. Χάριν ἔχω τῷ ἐνδυναμώσαντί με Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν, ὅτι πιστόν με ἡγήσατο θέμενος εἰς διακονίαν κ.τ.λ.

These words Professor Souter translates thus :—

" in accordance with the gospel of the glory of the happy god (*sic*) with which I have been entrusted. Gratitude is what I feel towards him who has filled me with power, (the) Messiah Jesus, our Lord, because he considered me faithful, putting me into service."

I will not dwell on his rendering of *μακάριος* by " happy," though objection might reasonably be taken to this, seeing that " blessedness " rather than " happiness " is usually predicated of the Deity. My objection here is rather to the rendering of *πιστόν* as " faithful " just after *ἐπιστεύθην* has been translated " I have been entrusted." Surely if the true connexion between the two verses is to be understood it is of the first importance to preserve the thought common to *ἐπιστεύθην* and *πιστόν*. And this can easily be done. If we translate *ὃ ἐπιστεύθην* by " wherewith I was entrusted," or, as in R.V., " which was committed to my trust," then let *πιστόν* be translated " trustworthy," " worthy of trust," or " fit to be trusted."

It is remarkable that even the R.V. has missed this point, and, missing it, has missed too the true connexion between *v.* 11 and *v.* 12, and indeed has begun a new paragraph at *v.* 12, as if an entirely new subject had been introduced. There is seen to be a clear train of thought from the one verse to the other, if the close kinship of *ἐπιστεύθην* and *πιστόν* be kept in mind. St. Paul has been led to speak of the gospel of the glory of the blessed God with which he has been entrusted, and this carries him on to emphasise the fact that the trust, committed to him, proceeds entirely from grace. So he expresses his gratitude to Christ Jesus,

who had accounted him worthy of the trust and enlisted him in service, though he had aforetime been a blasphemer and a persecutor and injurious (*or* insolent, *ὑβριστήν*). Mercy was shewn him because he had acted ignorantly in unbelief, and it was entirely Divine grace that had made him other than he once had been.

It may, of course, be said that in translating *πιστόν* by the word "faithful" the Revisers were using the term in the sense of "trustworthy." But it is unfortunate that the word chosen by them does not more easily carry the reader back to the thought of the entrustment spoken of in *v.* 11. The Apostle had been put in trust with the gospel before he had been proved faithful. Christ had accounted him worthy to be trusted even before he had been tried. The word "faithful" is more appropriately used of one who has *proved* himself deserving of trust. This St. Paul had not done when he was entrusted with the gospel. He had not yet been found faithful, but Christ counted him fit to be trusted, and it is for this that the Apostle gives Him thanks.

We come now to the second point which I must criticise in Professor Souter's translation of 1 Timothy i. In this chapter we have the word *παραγγελία* (charge) used twice, and the kindred verb *παραγγέλλειν* (to charge) once. Thus in verse 3 we have :—

"As I exhorted thee to tarry at Ephesus when I was going into Macedonia, that thou mightest charge (*παραγγείλῃς*) certain men not to teach a different doctrine (*ἑτεροδιδασκαλεῖν*)," etc.

And then in verse 5 we read :—

"The end of the charge (*τὸ τέλος τῆς παραγγελίας*) is love out of a pure heart and a good conscience and faith unfeigned."

One would naturally suppose that "the charge" spoken of in this last quoted verse had reference to the purpose of Timothy's being left at Ephesus that he might *charge* certain men not ἑτεροδιδασκαλεῖν, and this point is brought out in the R.V., though missed in the A.V., where we have in *v.* 3, "that thou mightest charge," and in *v.* 5 "the end of the commandment." The Apostle had laid it upon Timothy to give a certain charge. This charge he speaks of in *v.* 3, where he uses the verb παραγγέλλειν, and in *v.* 5, where he employs the noun παραγγελία. The same charge is again referred to, I take it, in *v.* 18 much lower down, where the noun παραγγελία occurs again: "This charge I commit unto thee, my child Timothy." Nor must these last quoted words be understood as equivalent to "This I charge thee."

Now let us look at Professor Souter's translation. Verse 3 he translates thus:—

"Even as I warned you to prolong your stay at Ephesus, when I was travelling into Macedonia, that you might inform (παραγγείλῃς) certain people not to teach other matters."

Verse 5 he renders as follows:—

"But the goal (τέλος) of exhortation (τῆς παραγγελίας) is love (which springs) from a clean mind and a good consciousness and an unfeigned faith."

When Professor Souter comes to παραγγελία in *v.* 18, he consistently translates it again into "exhortation," but it is to be observed that in translating ἵνα παραγγείλῃς by "that you might *inform*" he has missed a point, and the meaning of τὸ τέλος τῆς παραγγελίας in *v.* 5 is lost.

The Apostle says to Timothy in effect: I left you behind to give a certain charge. Well, I want you to understand that the end, the purpose, of this charge is so and so.

It seems to me that Professor Souter practically ignores the article before παραγγελίας in verse 5. He translates "the goal of exhortation." But it is the goal, the end of

the exhortation, or charge, that is the charge already implied in παραγγείλῃς in verse 3. It is, of course, open to Professor Souter to say that he has not really ignored the article. Understanding παραγγελία to be exhortation in general, he has taken ἡ παραγγελία to mean "the thing called exhortation," abstract nouns taking the article in Greek but not in English. But then exhortation in general may have other ends besides that of which the Apostle here speaks. What he sets forward as the end is the end of the particular charge which he had left Timothy behind to give to those who were losing themselves in unimportant things, or in things mischievous. It was all-important that emphasis should be laid on the great issues of Christian life—love out of a pure heart, and a good conscience and faith unfeigned. These are the things on which Timothy is to lay stress. These are the τέλος of the charge the Apostle has ordered him to give. This charge, he says in verse 18, he commits to him according to the prophecies which led the way to him.

Of this last quoted phrase it is no part of my present purpose to write. The object of this paper has been to draw attention to what seem to me blemishes in Professor Souter's rendering, whether it be called a translation or "a crib." A crib should, as he says, partake largely of the characteristics of its original. But I have tried to shew that certain characteristics of the original have in the present case been lost.

In conclusion I would say a few words on the anakoluthon of verse 5. In the A.V. this is got over by the insertion of the words "*so do*" and in the R.V. by the words "*so do I now*." But is it necessary to insert any words at all? Is it not better to preserve the anakoluthon of the original? The principal sentence which should follow on verses 3 and 4 is wanting. The Apostle has, as it were, lost himself in the maze of his subordinate sentences, but he sets out very

forcibly the leading idea in his mind when he writes : " The end of the charge is love out of a pure heart, and a good conscience and faith unfeigned." The δὲ belonging to this sentence may be appropriately rendered by our English " well," which we use sometimes to recover ourselves after a maze of sentences. So I would venture to translate something after this manner :—

As I exhorted thee to tarry at Ephesus, when I was going into Macedonia, that thou mightest teach certain men not to teach a different doctrine, neither to give heed to fables, etc., etc. Well, the end of the charge is love out of a pure heart, and a good conscience, and faith unfeigned.

E. H. Askwith.

FURTHER REMARKS IN RESPONSE TO DR. ABBOTT'S " MISCELLANEA EVANGELICA."

It was not of any set purpose that I neglected to offer the explanation called for by Dr. Abbott, as regards the silence of the Synoptists in reference to John's being found in company with Peter at the palace of the high priest. It would have been a very different thing if they had said nothing of Peter's presence, or of Peter's denial, in accordance with the warning of our Lord ; above all, of Peter's repentance. To omit this would have been equivalent to the omission of David's sin and David's repentance in the story of the Old Testament ; but no such great issue depended on the presence of John. Supposing the door had been opened to Peter by a friendly servant of Caiaphas, what difference would it have made ? Bishop Lightfoot seems to me to have very well handled the argument from silence, in his article on Eusebius contained in his *Essays on Supernatural Religion*. Dr. Abbott has himself done much to prove the trustworthiness of the latest Gospel by the manner in which the writer has

criticised and supplemented the accounts of the Synoptists. Nay, has not the writer himself sufficiently justified these additions, when he says, in the language of Eastern hyperbole, that no books could ever give a complete account of all that Jesus did ?

The other point on which it seems desirable that I should say a word or two, is the reason assigned by Nonnus for John's acquaintance with Caiaphas. Dr. Abbott still despairs of making any sense of the lines 71 foll.—

> καὶ νέος ἄλλος ἑταῖρος, ὃς ἰχθυβόλου παρὰ τέχνης
> γνωτὸς ἐὼν ἀρίδηλος ἐθήμονος ἀρχιερῆος
> Χριστῷ σύνδρομος ἦλθεν—

which I translate, "*And another, a youthful comrade* (or, as Dr. Abbott, "and a young man, another companion *of Christ*), *who, being from his trade of fisherman, a well-known acquaintance of the customary high-priest* (i.e., the high priest whom he was accustomed to call on in his rounds), *came hastening with Christ.*"

Dr. Abbott goes so far as to say, "How Nonnus supposed that this could make him 'a friend of the high priest,' I cannot even imagine." Does he mean that it is impossible for a customer to be a friend of his tradesman ? I should say it was a very natural and ordinary procedure, especially when the tradesman was as interesting and attractive as the son of Zebedee. The word ἐθήμων is constantly used in all sorts of ways by the very careless Nonnus, and not limited at all to such a use as that of συνήθης, to which Dr. Abbott is disposed to confine it. We find, for instance, ἐθήμονι κείμενον εὐνῇ, "laid in his usual couch" (instead of starting up at the stirring of the water); ἐθήμονι λαίλαπι λύσσης, "a regular storm of fury"; xxi 13 "bread and fish, a sailor's ordinary meal"; xviii. 19 "the high priest asked Jesus with a customary movement of his hand" (ἐθήμονι

χειρὸς ἐρωῆ). Many other cases are given in the index to Nonnus.

The passage in which Dr. Abbott (contrary to what one might have expected from him) puts the aristocratic objection most strongly is in p. 172: "Are we to suppose that by means of this piscatorial connexion, discontinued three years before,[1] this youthful and not very wealthy fishmonger—the younger son of a father owning (so far as we know) but one out of some 330 fishing-boats on the sea of Tiberias, had become a well known acquaintance of his customer, the high priest?"

There is a peculiar construction in the phrase ἰχθυβόλου παρὰ τέχνης γνωτὸς ἐών, which is noticed in Schmid's *Atticismus*, vol. 3, p. 461, where he refers to Kühner, *Gr.* ii.[2] 442, and quotes στεφάνων ἠξίωμαι παρὰ τῆς τέχνης.

J. B. Mayor.

[1] Is this really quite certain? Must the fishers of men cease entirely from ordinary fishing any more than the tentmaker from his trade?

PROFESSOR S. R. DRIVER.

Quarter of a century ago Old Testament scholarship was represented in Great Britain by four men of the highest distinction. The first to be taken from us was Robertson Smith, the hardest of all our losses to bear, for he was cut off when he was opening up new fields of research, more fruitful for the illumination of the Old Testament than the works he had specifically devoted to that subject, where also his familiarity with the whole Semitic field and with anthropology combined with his intimate knowledge of Scripture to initiate far-reaching theories. He died with only a portion of his great work on Semitic religion completed, and who knows with what other masterpieces of learning unwritten, with which, had longer life been granted him, he might have enriched us? To his teacher, Dr. A. B. Davidson, length of days was given, and the value of his work in training the ministry of his Church and in quietly preparing for the revolution which criticism has brought with it can hardly be over-estimated. His books and articles were justly treasured, yet they scarcely revealed the full measure of his power; and of the two volumes, to which we were looking as affording him an ampler scope for his genius, one was not written, and the publication of the other has been but a dubious service to his memory. But when he, too, was taken from us we could still console ourselves with the reflection that Dr. Cheyne and Dr. Driver were left to us. To the stimulus, the learning, the masterly and suggestive interpretation, the dauntless courage of the

former, many of us had long owed much. But while we can never think of him without veneration and gratitude, he soon began to tread a path along which it was not possible for even his most devoted admirers to accompany him. And now that Dr. Driver has followed Robertson Smith and Davidson within the veil, we cannot but feel that the last word has been written in one of the most notable chapters in the Biblical scholarship of our land.

The scholar, whose premature death we are mourning with a sense of irreparable loss, was born on the 2nd of October, 1846, so that he was only sixty-seven when he died; and till shortly before his death it seemed as if he would be spared to complete the heavy programme of work to which he was committed. He was educated at Winchester, and New College, Oxford, where he had a distinguished career, winning the Hebrew scholarships and Syriac prize, and being elected in 1870 to a fellowship at New College, which he held, with a tutorship from 1875, till he succeeded Pusey as Professor of Hebrew and Canon of Christ Church in 1882, when he was only midway between thirty and forty. He began authorship early with an edition in 1871 of the commentary on Jeremiah and Ezekiel by Moses ben Shesheth. In the nature of the case the appeal of such a volume was not very wide, but in 1874 he won a far more extended fame by a treatise on *The Use of the Tenses in Hebrew and some Other Syntactical Questions*. This attracted attention not only in Great Britain but on the Continent, and gave the writer a secure position among the foremost authorities on Hebrew grammar. In 1876 he edited, in collaboration with Dr. Cheyne, the Old Testament portion of the Variorum Bible. It is not easy to estimate how much self-denying drudgery the production of this work must have entailed, or praise too warmly the accuracy and skill with which it was carried through. Later editions made it more useful still, and it

is to be hoped that the work may sometime be brought up to date, a task, it is true, now much more formidable than when it was originally undertaken. In this year also he joined the Old Testament Revision Committee, remaining a member of it till its work was done. One cannot help wishing that the work had been delayed till he and Robertson Smith and Cheyne and those who worked with them could have wielded a dominating influence. They exercised, no doubt, a wholesome restraint on the timid and reactionary tendencies of the older members; but, as Dr. Driver once said in a letter to me, the time was not yet ripe for a revision to be undertaken. In the following year he published, in collaboration with Neubauer, *The Fifty-third Chapter of Isaiah according to the Jewish Interpreters.* In 1880 he returned to the field in which his first work had been done with an edition of *The Book of Proverbs attributed to Abraham ibn Ezra.* Apart from articles and new editions of earlier publications there is little to record for several years. But from 1888 onwards the stream of publication flowed in considerable volume. In that year he issued his little work on *Isaiah* in the series known as *Men of the Bible.* This showed that on the critical problems of that book he accepted a critical position of a moderate kind, similar in fact to that taken by Gesenius in his classical commentary. In the previous year he had in some Sunday School lessons, prematurely brought to a close, indicated his acceptance of certain critical conclusions with reference to the Pentateuch (*Critical Notes on the International Sunday School Lessons from the Pentateuch for* 1887). This had in fact been clear from earlier articles and reviews, notably from his contribution to the *Journal of Philology* in 1882 on "Some Alleged Linguistic Affinities of the Elohist." But it was not till the publication, in 1891, of his famous *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament* that his critical position on Old

Testament problems in general was clearly defined. The volume was an instant and a remarkable success. New editions followed each other with rapidity; the sixth, which was published six years later, was so thoroughly revised that it was set up from fresh type. The seventh edition came out in the following year, and was four times reprinted. The eighth appeared in 1909 considerably revised, though not so drastically as the sixth. The ninth, to which two important discussions had been added, was issued towards the end of last year. I have deserted the chronological order that I might mention some of his leading works on Higher Criticism together; but in 1890 he had published *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel.* It was specially valuable to the student of the language, but important also as an introduction to palæography and the principles of Lower Criticism, for the application of which the notoriously corrupt text of Samuel provides ample opportunity. The volume was hardly a commentary in the ordinary sense, but in value to the student of the Hebrew text of the Old Testament it is probably surpassed by none of the author's works. Happily before he passed away he had given us a second edition, thoroughly revised and enlarged, partly by incorporation of the results of discovery and research in the meantime, partly by very serviceable discussions of topographical problems. In 1892 his solitary volume of sermons entitled *Sermons on Subjects connected with the Old Testament* supplied a useful supplement to his *Introduction.* In collaboration with Mr. H. A. Wh te he prepared an edition of the Hebrew text of Leviticus for *The Sacred Books of the Old Testament*, which was followed in 1898 by the English translation and notes. In 1895 *The International Critical Commentary*, for the Old Testament portion of which he and Dr. Briggs were the editors, began to appear. Of the three volumes then issued he con-

tributed that on Deuteronomy, its companions being the brilliant volume on Judges by Professor G. F. Moore, and the famous contribution to the interpretation of Romans by Dr. Sanday and Dr. Headlam. Whether we may look forward to any part of his commentary on Job in the same series I do not know. He told me that when his new edition of Samuel was completed he hoped to take up the Job. But I rather fancy that other tasks intervened. I was disappointed that his little edition of Job was simply a republication of the Revised Version text with an Introduction and annotations. It was useful for the ordinary educated reader, for whom it was specially designed; but a new translation from an emended text is badly needed, in which, further, some attempt might be made to relegate the later insertions to an appendix and present the poem in something more nearly approaching to its original form. At one time he hoped to write the Commentary on Isaiah xl.–lxvi. in the *International*, but pressure of other work compelled him, to our great loss, to relinquish the task to other hands. He made three notable contributions to *The Cambridge Bible* in the volumes on *Joel and Amos*, on *Daniel* and on *Exodus*, the last of these being a particularly solid and thorough piece of work. For *The Century Bible* he wrote the Commentary on the last six of the Minor Prophets. For *The Westminster Commentaries* he edited Genesis. For *The Oxford Church Bible Commentary* he had promised to write on Hosea, Psalms, and Chronicles. These volumes were to contain new translations. Apart from Leviticus he had translated the Psalms (*The Parallel Psalter*, 1898), and Jeremiah (*The Book of the Prophet Jeremiah*, 1906). Two specially important contributions to Hebrew scholarship remain to be mentioned, his editions of Deuteronomy, Joshua, and Ecclesiastes for Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica*; and above all his co-operation with Dr. Brown

and Dr. Briggs in the preparation of the Oxford Hebrew Lexicon. Nor is the tale of his work even yet complete. He not only enriched Dr. Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible* with characteristically learned, thorough, and sober articles, but he took an important share in revising the proofs. He wrote for the second edition of Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*, for the *Encyclopædia Biblica*, and smaller dictionaries and also for magazines, notably the Expositor. A very balanced and lucid exposition of the light thrown by modern excavation and epigraphy on the Old Testament was given in the volume entitled *Authority and Archæology, Sacred and Profane*, of which he purposed issuing a revised edition. He returned to this subject in his *Schweich Lectures* on *Modern Research as Illustrated in the Bible* (1909). The record of achievement is truly remarkable when we have regard not simply to the bulk, which was great, but the quality of the work ; and it becomes still more so when we remember how much of his time was absorbed by other duties or self-imposed tasks. Teaching and academic affairs took much time, much also was given to the performance of his editorial duties, as the prefaces to the volumes of the *International Critical Commentary* contributed by British scholars, reveal. I shall not forget how, when I was diffident about undertaking an important task that he had been forced to abandon, among other considerations which he urged to overcome my scruples was his spontaneous assurance that he would gladly give me his counsel on any point on which I desired to consult him. His correspondence must, I think, have been very large. Sometimes it was a crowded postcard, sometimes a long, elaborate letter, but always stimulating and instructive, with judgments which even when they only repeated what was familiar, were weighty because they were his judgments.

A man's greatest work is often not accomplished in the

sphere where his qualities are highest, nor is he always most pre-eminent in those gifts which shine most conspicuously to the public eye. The field in which Dr. Driver first attained distinction was that in which first and foremost he was a master. In philology, as in every subject he undertook, his industry was unshrinking. He made an exhaustive collection of his facts, expounded them with accuracy and precision. The greatest pains had been taken to get even the minute detail right, the facts were classified, their interrelations exhibited, and from the large induction of instances the law of the phenomena was deduced. But he was not a mere "hodman of science," though he did his spade labour himself. His delicate insight into grammatical laws, his fine discrimination of the value of words, his sympathy with the temper and spirit of the language rose to genius. This brilliant and finished scholarship was of great value both in his exegetical and his critical work. The scholar valued it highly; but had he limited himself to grammar and lexicon and the editing of texts, the world at large would have felt little or no interest in his achievements, however masterly. Few have the equipment to appraise pure scholarship, but it is comparatively easy to follow large parts at any rate of the critical case and estimate the strength of the arguments. And Dr. Driver was qualified, as probably no one else, to do the work which then needed to be done and to secure the triumph of criticism. He was fortunate alike in the opportunity and in his own qualities. The way had been prepared for him. The controversies about Samuel Davidson and Colenso had come and gone, but they had at least familiarised the English public with the fact that new views on the Old Testament were entertained by a growing number of scholars; though our insular self-complacency made it easy to assume that criticism made in Germany was likely enough to be fantastic, subjective,

arbitrary, and governed by illegitimate presuppositions. And the conservative victory, that at least seemed to have been won in New Testament criticism, was a reassuring omen for the rehabilitation of the Old Testament. But the Robertson Smith controversy had broken up the fallow ground, though more in Scotland than in England. The translation of Ewald's *History of Israel*, his *Prophets*, and his *Poets of the Old Testament*; of Kuenen's *Religion of Israel*, and *The Hexateuch*; and of Wellhausen's *Prolegomena*; Stanley's popularisation of Ewald; Robertson Smith's *Old Testament in the Jewish Church* and his *Prophets of Israel*; the ninth edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, in which the best German criticism was made accessible to a wider public; the growing influence of Dr. Cheyne, whose commentaries on *Isaiah* and the *Psalms*, his *Job and Solomon* and his *Bampton Lectures*, it must be remembered, all antedated Dr. Driver's *Introduction*; had prepared the way for his survey of the whole field. The new views were already being taught to some extent in Universities and Theological Colleges. My own position was probably pretty much that of many others among the younger men. I had been convinced as to the truth of the critical view and was already teaching it. Among my Oxford friends at the time this attitude was fairly general. Accordingly when the *Introduction* appeared a large audience was ready for it.

And he was exceptionally fortunate in his qualifications for the work. No one else could have done for us in England what he did. His reputation as one of the world's foremost Hebraists gave assurance as to the impeccability of his scholarship, and he had the advantage of that close, intimate familiarity with the text itself which preoccupation with philology enforces, but which does not lie behind everything that is written on Biblical criticism. In the next place his own critical development had been of a kind to make his

judgment weighty when it came. For a considerable part of his career he had been fairly non-committal on critical questions. In *The Life of William Robertson Smith* the authors say, " It is of interest to note that it was not until 1882 that Professor Driver became convinced of the truth of the Graf-Wellhausen view of the dates of the documents of the Pentateuch " (p. 551). I am not aware on what grounds this date is fixed, as no reference is given. So far as public expression of opinion goes, that year is connected in my own mind with the publication of his article in the *Journal of Philology* on *Some Alleged Linguistic Affinities of the Elohist.* From that article it was quite clear that he accepted the literary analysis of the Hexateuch and, in fact, believed that the phraseological criteria sufficed, often with complete certainty, to distinguish the different writers (p. 202). And it was not his object to establish a particular view as to the date of P. His paper was a rather severe criticism of Giesebrecht's attempt to prove that the affinities of P in language are with writers about the period of the exile. No conclusion is offered on the main problem, but the general tone of it suggests an unfavourable rather than a favourable attitude to the Grafian theory. A definite solution he had apparently not reached when he wrote this article. He says : " The problems, literary and historical, presented by the *Grundschrift*, are complicated and difficult ; and no solution that may be offered of them can for the present be regarded as other than provisional." Even in the preface to his *Bampton Lectures*, written just before the *Introduction* appeared, Professor Cheyne wrote of his colleague, " As a student of the language and grammatical sense of the Old Testament, I have long since had a high respect for his opinion ; as a critic I do not yet know to what extent we agree. Slowly have time and study melted his conscientious reserve, and made him in a

double sense my comrade. But his excellent though in some points over-cautious handbook to Isaiah and his recent article in the *Contemporary Review* (Feb. 1890) leave no doubt to which side upon the whole his judgment inclines, and his known fairness and candour, and the solidity of his exegetical basis, will give special value to his book at the present juncture" (p. xxiv.). This slowness to advance and the caution with which he tested the solidity of the ground gave a peculiar weight to his adhesion when it was actually announced. Clearly he had no love of novelty for its own sake, if he moved forward it would be because he was driven by sheer pressure of the evidence. Another very noteworthy quality of his criticism was its objective character. His type of mind resembled Lightfoot's, and it had a peculiar attraction to English students. His positions were supported by hard facts and black and white reasons, admirably marshalled, lucidly expressed, judicially stated. With subjective, incommunicable impressions he had little to do; he always turned by instinctive preference to arguments that would appeal to the common sense of the average cultivated reader. Hence it was difficult, except for prejudice, to discount them as viewy. Above all he was endeared to the English mind by his moderation. Temperamentally cautious and distrustful of extremes, he studied both sides of his case, prepared to recognise what was good in each, to hold the scales evenly, and register the verdict with the impartiality of a judge. If he found, on the whole, for the progressives it might be inferred with some confidence that their case was pretty strong.

In other words, a quality which contributed as much as anything to the wide acceptance and high regard in which the volume was held was, from a purely scientific standpoint, a limitation. The book was reviewed in three notable articles contributed by Professor Cheyne to the Expositor

(February, March and April, 1892), and republished in a fuller form in *Founders of Old Testament Criticism.* There was no lack of candour about the articles, and one can well believe how unwelcome the writer felt his task to be. With hearty recognition of the admirable features of the book there went an undisguised exhibition of its critical shortcomings. "Faithful are the wounds of a friend," and this was a friendly criticism. Leaving details aside, I felt when I read the articles that their general standpoint was right in the main. The book was too much of a compromise with conservatism. The author often did not accept the conclusions to which his general position would have seemed logically to commit him. He had a leaning to dates as early as he could accept without abandoning his loyalty to critical principles. It would sometimes happen that in his judicial statement his arguments would seem stronger for the view which he did not accept. Thus in his commentary on Amos, Wellhausen's case for referring the closing verses to a later hand was impartially stated, but on the whole it was felt safer to acquiesce in the genuineness. Yet this tendency to "blunt the edge of his criticism," to use Dr. Cheyne's expression, no doubt contributed not a little to the cordial acceptance with which the *Introduction* was greeted and the far-reaching influence which it exercised. The more timid felt that this gentle regard for the scruples and prejudices of the weaker brethren made criticism in his hands less dangerous and objectionable than in the hands of those who said all they thought with a ruthless disregard of conservative sentiment. No doubt others were aware that Satan is all the more seductive when he is robed as an angel of light. Another feature of his work I have always found it difficult to understand. This I can illustrate by a reference to the sixth edition of his *Introduction.* This marked a great advance on the first. In the intervening

period discussion had been specially active with reference to the prophets. 1892 had been distinguished by two such outstanding books as Duhm's *Isaiah* and Wellhausen's *Minor Prophets*, 1895 by Cheyne's *Introduction to Isaiah*. In the department of Old Testament Theology we had the first edition of Smend's *Alttestamentliche Religionsgeschichte* in 1893. When the sixth edition of the *Introduction* came into my hands I naturally looked to see how the author had handled the questions on which his first edition had been criticised as unsatisfactory ; but I was still more interested to discover his attitude to views on highly important problems which, if not always novel, had been sustained with new and weighty arguments and commanded the adhesion of very eminent scholars. Here, however, I was doomed to disappointment. So far as Isaiah was concerned, lists of passages retained for Isaiah by Duhm and Cheyne were given, and their detailed analysis of the last twenty-seven chapters, also a full account of Cheyne's views as to Isaiah xxiv.–xxvii. But the most vital questions received bare mention and no discussion. These touched the authenticity of the Messianic prophecies in ix. and xi. and the authorship and date of the Servant passages. Of equal importance was the authenticity of Jeremiah's prophecy on the New Covenant. This was rejected by Stade without discussion in his *History of Israel*, but Smend devoted a long and closely argued note to it. While his arguments convinced me that a good deal in Jeremiah xxx.–xxxi. was post-Jeremianic, I could not believe that he had made out his case on the most important question of all. When I turned to Dr. Driver for strengthening in my faith I discovered to my dismay that the existence of the problem was not even mentioned. I find it difficult to understand the reason. He was not one of those futile people who fancy they have disposed of a view they do not like when they have labelled

it as "wild." His conception of criticism and what was due to eminent scholars was much worthier than that. But I confess that I have always been puzzled that, when questions not one-twentieth so important received careful statement and examination, questions of such pre-eminent moment for our reconstruction of Israel's religious history should either be passed over in silence or dismissed with the barest mention and no discussion. For an adequate treatment of the problems I have named, one student at least would have been more grateful than for almost anything else in the volume. I can only suppose that he thought of the views I have mentioned as critical extravagances with which time might be left to deal. Unfortunately in the meantime they have won adherents, and these among the most distinguished scholars.

I am sorry to be writing in what may seem an ungracious strain of a work to which our debt is so great, but I desire such words of gratitude as it may be fitting for me to offer to be entirely sincere, and not with indiscriminate eulogy to mar my tribute by hollowness or undue reticence. To what I have said another thing must be added. He did not propound critical theories of his own. He was rather the judge than the original investigator; but a judge with full expert equipment, who had worked through the subject independently, with ample knowledge of the case on all sides, and after a masterly summing up pronounced his verdict, remembering the legal maxim that possession is nine-tenths of the law.

Of his commentaries on their critical side it is not necessary to speak, for the qualities displayed in the *Introduction* were equally evident in them. On the exegetical side the student could count, it is needless to say, on a philological basis deeply laid and firmly constructed of the best materials. His scholarship, wide in its range, accurate, finished, and

delicate, found here full scope for expression, notably in the commentaries on the Hebrew Text, such as *Samuel* and *Deuteronomy*. His intolerance of anything slovenly or half-done often led him into elaborate research, sometimes on subjects where nine writers out of ten would have found their conscience much sooner satisfied. The elaborate discussions of the topography, which add so much value to the second edition of the *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel*, had their origin in his desire to illustrate the force of the phrases "went up," "came down." From this he was led on to his notes on sites in consequence of the many incorrect or questionable identifications in English maps, a subject which he also treated in several important articles. While the notes are brief, they embody the results of considerable research. So he tells us in his preface to the Commentary on Exodus that the note on one word. *stacte*, in Exodus xxx. involved a correspondence with Sir W. Thiselton-Dyer, in addition to much independent research. The scale of treatment might vary, according to the series to which he was contributing. But immense labour and the most painstaking investigation lay behind all he wrote. Qualities such as these made his commentaries indispensable, his notes were often condensed Encyclopaedia articles. But a commentator must have more than pure scholarship and massive learning, if he is to do the highest type of exegetical work. He must have the exegetical instinct, the faculty to think himself into the situation of the author, gradually to feel his way into his mind and look out through his eyes, and then with glow and enthusiasm interpret the ancient document to the modern mind. The interpreter of God's word should have in his measure the same penetrating quality; sharper than a two-edged sword, his exposition should cleave through the joints into the marrow, and cutting right down through the soul into the spirit lay

bare its inmost recesses. I would not claim that any interpreter fully rises to such an ideal, but the kind of exegesis that I mean may be exemplified by works of such pre-eminent quality as Duhm's *Isaiah* and *Jeremiah*, Cornill's *Jeremiah*, and Gunkel's *Genesis*. I think that Dr. Driver's mind was hardly of that type. He had, so far as one could judge from his published work, little if any speculative interest or passion for ideas. Where the commentator had to deal with objective facts of history or geography, of archaeology or institutions, there Dr. Driver was very successful. His characterisation of personalities was often as happy as his handling of events. His statement of conflicting views as to the interpretation of a passage was impartial and exact, his decision sober, and free from everything that was fanciful or arbitrary. And yet, if I must indicate the other side, I may perhaps suggest it by recalling Hort's very just and felicitous verdict on Lightfoot, that the leading characteristic of his commentaries was masculine good sense without either the insight or the delusion of subtlety. I found his Commentary on *Genesis* the most disappointing, and all the more so that he had been preceded by Gunkel. Of the greatness and originality, the sympathetic insight and exegetical genius, which Gunkel's commentary on Genesis displays, I almost shrink from saying what I think, lest I should seem to be extravagant. But I know scarcely any commentary of modern times that I should be prepared to rank along with it, even when allowance has been made for the defects of its qualities. If one had to fix on the name of any single exegete, who more than another represented Dr. Driver's ideal, I suppose it would be Dillmann.

Of the man himself one may speak with reverence and affection. His great gifts did not tempt him to indolence, they were a trust to be employed with the most strenuous

industry. He did not spare himself in his desire to be helpful to others. He was kind and considerate in heart, gentle and gracious in bearing. In controversy he was calm and fair-minded. He kept his integrity inviolate, not simply in the moral but in the more difficult intellectual sphere. He was genuinely humble and correspondingly generous in his appreciation of others. His Christian temper was so free from all ostentation, that it is only as one thinks quietly over his life and work that it becomes plain how deep and central and all-pervasive it was. His faith was drawn from the Bible, his spiritual life was nourished by it; he walked with God in humility, in confidence and in peace, quietly and without display. He did a work for true religion and sound learning in our midst which no other had it in him to do. He rests from his long labours, assured of a gratitude that will not quickly fade.

ARTHUR S. PEAKE.

CHRISTIANITY BEFORE THE GOSPELS.

Probably few but professed theologians realise that for a considerable time Christianity existed without the support of any one of the canonical Gospels. Of course a moment's thought will shew that there must have been a nascent Church, and teaching about the Church's Founder, before any written record came into existence, but till the contrary is pointed out, most people will naturally regard the interval as very short. We are so familiar with the English New Testament and the order of its contents that an effort of mind is required to grasp the fact that the order is not the chronological order of original publication—if indeed we can properly speak of the *publication* of some of the documents at all. Was it *publication* for St. Paul's letters to be read in the congregations at Thessalonica, or Corinth, or Rome? In this sense their publication virtually synchronised with their composition, and it was followed by their being copied for the use of other Churches. All this was before the production of a written Gospel, and it took time. And this fact is exactly what it is so difficult to grasp. The popular idea would be represented by the following sentences from Didon's *Jesus Christ*, published in 1891:

"On ne peut préciser la durée exacte du temps écoulé entre le début de la prédication apostolique at l'apparition du premier Mémoir écrit. Ce temps dut être fort court. La tradition universelle de l'Eglise place la composition du premier Evangile entre l'an 33 et l'an 40 de l'ère chrétienne." [1]

This thoroughly unscientific statement is characteristic of the whole book, which nevertheless bears the imprimatur of the Holy See. What fate befell Tyrrell, Loisy, and other independent thinkers is too well known to need recalling.

[1] p. 19.

The above opinion is by no means that of critical scholars, who agree with remarkable unanimity that at least some thirty years must have elapsed between the crucifixion of Christ and the publication of the first canonical Gospel, that "according to St. Mark." This comparatively early dating is the result of what amounts to a revolution in New Testament criticism, which little more than a generation ago was disposed to place the Gospels much later. But the schools of Strauss and Baur are so dead, largely owing to the labours in our own country of Lightfoot, Wescott and Salmon, that I understand it is no longer considered necessary to instruct candidates for Holy Orders even in the outlines of the "Mythical" and the "Tendency" theories, and the arguments against them. The canonical Gospels are now brought much nearer to the first beginnings of Christianity, but still there is the gap of thirty years or more.

Before proceeding further, it may be well to establish this position by brief quotations from three or four representative theologians. So far back as 1897, F. Godet, of Neuchâtel, treating Matthew as the earliest Gospel, dates it "quelque peu antérieur à l'an 66, où commença la guerre, et où est lieu l'émigration de l'Eglise de l'autre coté du Jourdain."[1]

In 1902, Dr. Armitage Robinson, then Canon (afterwards Dean) of Westminster, and now Dean of Wells, assigned "the year 65 as a probable date" for Mark, not excluding the possibility that it might be some years earlier, if it was written during St. Peter's lifetime, and if St. Peter suffered under Nero.[2]

In 1910, Dr. J. M. Wilson, Canon of Worcester, wrote: "About thirty years after the crucifixion of Christ, that

[1] *Introduction au Nouveau Testament*, ii. p. 249.
[2] *The Study of the Gospels*, p. 17.

is about the year A.D. 63, certainly before A.D. 70, there was written a short book which, at the time, was without any parallel or precedent in literature . . . the book which we know as 'the Gospel according to St. Mark.'" [1]

In October 1911 the acknowledged leader of New Testament scholarship in this country, Dr. Sanday, of Oxford, wrote:

"We may believe that . . . St. Mark (was written) not long before A.D. 70; St. Matthew, some years later, and St. Luke later still (about 80), and St. John nearer the end of the century." [2]

In Germany Professor Harnack's elaborate investigations have led him to the conclusion, in which he carries many other scholars with him, though not without vigorous dissentients, that:

"Die Schlussverse der Apostelgeschichte, im Zusammenhang mit dem Fehlen jeder Anspielung auf das Ende des Prozesses des Paulus und auf sein Martyrium im Buch, machen es im höchsten Grade wahrscheinlich dass das Werk geschrieben worden ist, als der Prozess des Paulus in Rom noch nicht beendet war." [3]

The importance of this for our present purpose is that it carries with it our third Gospel, an earlier work by the author of the *Acts*, and therefore *Mark* as well, if not *Matthew*. Personally I find a difficulty in thinking that Dr. Harnack has altogether proved his point. The latter part of *Acts* is practically a biography of St. Paul, and it is hard to convince oneself that a friend and companion would choose for the publication of his history the precise moment when that Apostle had been "two whole years" a prisoner "in his own hired dwelling." Why *Acts* should abruptly

[1] *Studies in the Origins and Aims of the Four Gospels*, p. 2.
[2] *Hibbert Journal*, x. No 1, p. 90.
[3] *Neue Untersuchungen zur Apostelgeschichte*, 1911, p. 96.

close just here is one of the puzzles of literature. Undoubtedly the simplest explanation is that nothing further is said because nothing further had happened. But is this credible? Anyhow, it is to be insisted that the famous German scholar, in this and other works, has made the earlier dating of the principal N.T. documents extremely probable. One cannot say *practically certain*, because assent is not absolutely universal. As he himself remarks, *à propos* of the "We sections," "Allein man kann viel leichter einer fragwürdigen Hypothese Glauben verschaffen, als einem strengen Beweis Anerkennung. So ist immer gewesen, und so wird es bleiben!"[1] Against prejudice one may argue and argue:

"Sed auræ
Omnia discerpunt, et nubibus irrita donant."

One more reference may be permitted. Crossing the Atlantic, we have Dr. B. W. Bacon, Professor in Yale University, assigning the appearance of the Gospel of Mark to c. 75 A.D. at Rome.[2]

It would be easy to multiply references, but these are quite enough to prove my point. Without claiming that scholars are yet agreed as to precise dates, I may at least assert that there is practical unanimity in the opinion that our earliest Gospel did not appear till some thirty years after the death of Christ. If one of the children whom on a memorable occasion Jesus took in His arms and blessed, was then five years old, he was getting on for middle age before he had a chance of reading any narrative now in our possession of the life of Him of whom he must have heard so much. For nearly, perhaps for altogether, a generation the growing Church did not possess a historical book which was destined to become canonical.

[1] Op. cit. p. 2.

[2] *The Making of the New Testament* (Home University Library), p. 107.

I put the fact in this way in order to bring it home the more forcibly to the mind. Is there now a missionary station in the world where the converts would be left for thirty years before any one of the Gospels was put into their hands? Is it not one of the first aims of missionaries to give the Gospels in their own language to the congregations they succeed in forming? What an impression would be made on the Christian world by the information that after thirty years of labour the isolated congregations in heathen lands were still without a copy of a single Gospel? And be it remembered, this space of time brings us only to the composition of *Mark*. No doubt it was at once read in the Church at Rome, or wherever it first became known; and no doubt other churches soon came to hear of it, and to ask for copies. But in those days of reproduction by hand and of slow travel, how long would it be before there was a general knowledge of *St. Mark* in the lands bordering on the Mediterranean Sea? *Mark* enters into the composition of both *Matthew* and *Luke*, and both these Gospels may have been produced within a few years; but how long a time would elapse before they were generally known and received? Definitely to answer this question is impossible, only a general statement can be made, allowing a wide margin for error; but this is of no importance for my present purpose. It must be abundantly plain, even to those who had never thought of it before, that for many years the Church developed, and the spiritual life of its members was nourished, without the aid of the canonical Gospels. It was not merely that individual Christians could not read them. That has happened too often, for want of education, in later epochs. It was that whole congregations must have been instructed by teachers who were themselves not acquainted with the Gospels, and that multitudes must have lived and died in that state.

Now, can we form any clear conception of what Christianity was in those days? For the thing—if we may call Christianity a *thing*—the thing existed, if not the name. "It came to pass that even for a whole year they (Barnabas and Saul) were gathered together with the Church, and taught much people, and that the disciples were called Christians first in Antioch."[1] The name *Christians* carries with it *Christianity*. Christianity without the Gospels? Yes, precisely that.

Nothing could be more interesting than to look back on the life of those earliest of all Christians, the disciples of Jesus and their immediate converts, and to sketch out, however roughly, a picture of their creed and conduct. At first sight it may be thought there can be no great difficulty in making such a picture. In the *Acts of the Apostles* we have a narrative of the expansion of the Church from the ascension of its Founder down to the time when it was firmly established in the capital of the Empire, where the Church's foremost champion, a prisoner indeed, was nevertheless engaged in an active propaganda with the tacit sanction of the authorities. But the prominence given to this champion in the latter part of the *Acts* is a reason for careful examination before we decide to accept the history as entirely adequate and complete. Its author, who I have no doubt was St. Luke, was manifestly a disciple and admirer of St. Paul. He accompanied that Apostle from time to time in his travels, probably in the capacity of the "beloved physician," and his literary work must be to some extent coloured by Pauline influence. Now Paul had never known Jesus in the flesh, any more than had Luke himself, and the former's Gospel is a gospel of the risen and ascended Christ. The Atonement, it is true, looms large in the Pauline letters, but it is because the crucifixion is followed, and one

[1] Acts xi. 26.

may say consummated, by the resurrection and the life in glory. If Paul had not been fully convinced of the latter, the former would have had no value for him. Every one knows of the Pauline doctrine of justification by faith, apart from the works of the Law, and of his great struggle against the Judaisers on behalf of the liberty of the Gentiles. St. Paul's friend and companion could not but be acquainted with what is so familiar to us, and when he compiled his history of the first age of the Church, he compiled it in the light of that knowledge. It may be, indeed it is, surprising that the narrative is not more strongly coloured by these views than it is, but all the same the colouring is there. The history would not have had quite the same tint if it had been depicted by a disciple of James, the Lord's brother. We have all seen those windows by which the same landscape is viewed through panes of various hues. Look through this rosy-tinted glass, and you see a landscape bathed in the warm glow of summer; look through that blue glass, and you see the same landscape with the sombre and cold hue of winter—incongruous it may be, with leaves and flowers, but winter none the less. And so the facts related by Luke, supposing them to be accurate in themselves, would bear another aspect if they came to us through a representative of another school. F. C. Baur and the Tübingen school made a wrong use of this fact. Neither *Acts* nor any other book of the New Testament is a "tendency" writing, as is now fully recognised, but all take their colouring from the particular school in which they arose. In saying this I am not seeking to discredit the *Acts* as a history, I am only uttering the caution that we must remember the same history might have been written with equal veracity from a different point of view. A Roman Catholic historian and a Protestant, with equal opportunities and abilities, and with equal honesty of purpose, would not

draw identical pictures of the Reformation. Luke gives us a history of the Church to which the Gospels were unknown, but that history might have been written very differently. We must not assume that *Acts* alone gives a complete representation of Christianity before the Gospels.

When we proceed to inquire what further factors must be taken into account, we are met at once by the admission that our four canonical Gospels are by no means the first attempts to meet the needs of the Church. The preface to the third Gospel informs us candidly that the author was only following the example of " many " who had " taken in hand to draw up a narrative concerning those matters which have been fulfilled among us," and that these earlier writers had reproduced what had been " delivered " by those " which from the beginning were eye-witnesses and ministers of the word." It is to be noticed that Luke does not attribute these earlier narratives to the eye-witnesses and ministers, but only to those who reported what the eye-witnesses and ministers said, a description which very well fits the Gospel of Mark, for Mark, according to the most ancient tradition, reproduced the teaching of Peter. Perhaps this description also fits Q, as we have learnt to call the source, in addition to Mark, which is common to Matthew and Luke. But it does not fit the Aramaic Logia attributed to Matthew the Apostle. Papias, bishop of Hierapolis in the former half of the second century, who is supposed to have been born between A.D. 60–70, and who was a hearer of John (probably the Elder, not the Apostle), is the authority for the well-known tradition preserved by Eusebius, that Matthew " composed the oracles in the Hebrew language, and each one interpreted them as he could." In the controversies arising out of these few and simple words reams of paper have been covered, but probably the true meaning is that Matthew wrote in Aramaic a collection of the sayings

of Jesus, perhaps with some incidental narrative of their occasion, but there was no authoritative Greek translation, each student or writer making the best use of the collection he could. It may be assumed that this collection lies somewhere at the basis of our first Gospel, and is the origin of its name. In saying this I am, of course, only repeating a conjecture which has been widely made. But Matthew the Apostle was certainly an eye-witness, so that Luke's preface cannot refer immediately to him, though it may refer to writers who had utilised his Logia. There may have been some narrative which worked up the Logia preserved by Matthew, just as Mark worked up the teaching of Peter. In any case it is obvious that the very first Christian teaching must have been oral, though it is possible that from the very beginning notes may have been made of some of the maxims of Jesus. Why should not some of His hearers have jotted down the sayings which most impressed them? The main *events* would not easily escape from memory, but *words* are evanescent. The words of Jesus ring truer than ever any other words rang, but sooner or later they had to be written down, and this very quality may be the reason why they were written down from the first.

The Gospels began to appear about thirty years or more after the Crucifixion; they were designed to meet the needs of the Church, and they arose out of the Church. The Church is not built on the New Testament; on the contrary, the New Testament is the literature of the inspired Church. Christianity is not properly the religion of a book; it is the religion of a person. The Gospels which became canonical set out the history and teaching of that Person with a fullness that had not hitherto been attempted, and they speedily made their way. There survives no record, no hint, of any authoritative sanction given to them by the Church as a whole, or by its leaders. They simply won

acceptance by their own merits. In what I am here writing I am thinking chiefly of the Synoptics. The Fourth Gospel comes later (heroic efforts to prove it the first of all have failed), and it is a theological treatise rather than a history. The most illuminating remark on it has been made by Loisy (whether by others before him I do not know), that all the discourses in it are discourses of the glorified Christ. Even the Synoptic Gospels are not biographies ; they are, as Justin Martyr called them, *ἀπομνημονεύματα*, " memoirs." Of necessity they differ among themselves, or there would have been one, not three. The later shew advance upon the earlier ; e.g., Mark relates that on first hearing the preaching of Jesus His neighbours exclaimed : " Is not this the carpenter ? " In Matthew this is softened down to : " Is not this the carpenter's son ? " Matthew and Luke have Nativity stories which are not in Mark. But on the whole the three agree in the representation of Jesus which they offer to the Church. *And the Church accepted it.* That is the point which I want to bring out. That the Church received these narratives and canonised them, proves that they did not contain a new doctrine. If the aim had been to foist on the Church a novel view of its Founder we should have heard something of it, and it is not likely that the aim would have been attained. That there were schisms and heresies almost from the beginning is not disguised in early Christian literature, but the fact of the reception of the Gospels by the Church as a whole throws a flood of light on the Church of the earlier days. It proves that they contained nothing essentially out of harmony with Christian teaching during the thirty years which followed the Crucifixion. By this time there were congregations over a great part of the civilised world ; a considerable time must have elapsed before the three were carried right round the Mediterranean, but wherever they

came—to Asia Minor or Greece, to Egypt or Rome, or Gaul —they were welcomed. Each of them might have borne on its forefront what Luke declared to Theophilus, that his intention in writing was "that thou mightest know the certainty of the things wherein thou wast instructed." The new books which became current contained no new doctrine; they stereotyped the teaching already prevalent. The figure they portrayed was the same figure which Christians already worshipped. This is a significant fact, because the usual tendency is for the second generation to belittle what its predecessor thought much of. The children throw mud at the idols worshipped by their fathers. The space of thirty years was just long enough for most of the contemporaries of Jesus to have died, and for another generation to have grown up with new ideals and new aspirations. If the contemporaries who survived, and the new generation, could alike welcome the writings which were beginning to circulate it must have been because these writings were in harmony with what they already held.

The new writings could not have attained their preeminent position without some quality which differentiated them from their predecessors. The one quality which above all others distinguished them was apparently their comprehensiveness. They gathered up and brought into order the materials which lay loosely scattered about in the various churches. There was the Jerusalem tradition; there was the Galilean tradition; there was the *Logia*, perhaps in more than one recension; there were notes made by eye-witnesses of the great events, hearers of the great words. Renan's theory of the compilation of the Gospels is probably truer of the documents which lie behind them. "There was no scruple in inserting additions, in variously combining them, and in completing some by others. The poor man who has but one book wishes that

it may contain all that is dear to his heart. These little books were lent, each one transcribed in the margin of his copy the words, and the parables he found elsewhere, which touched him. The most beautiful thing in the world has thus proceeded from an obscure and purely popular elaboration." Each of our four Gospels bears too many marks of original composition for this to be literally true, but it may well be approximately true of the elements which enter into them. On these elements Mark first laid masterful hands, working them up with his recollection of Peter's addresses, and the result is what we know. That but little genuine tradition escaped one or other of the Gospels is rendered probable not only, as already remarked, by their general reception, but by the scantiness of the gleanings in the same field. In an address reported in *Acts*, St. Paul impresses on his hearers "the words of the Lord Jesus . . . It is more blessed to give than to receive."[1] After Luke vi. 4, Codex Bezae (D, the famous Cambridge MS., a witness to the "Western" text) adds what may be a veritable survival from the great ministry, "On the same day, seeing a certain man working on the sabbath he said to him, Man, if thou knowest what thou art doing, happy art thou; but if thou knowest not, thou art cursed, and a transgressor of the law." In 1897, and again a few years later, Drs. Grenfell and Hunt disinterred at Oxyrhynchus a few "Logia," one or two of which it is tempting to think may be real additions to our collections of the sayings of Jesus, though others are obviously only variants of what we have already. Of the former category are these: "Except ye fast to the world, ye shall in no wise find the kingdom of God; and except ye make the sabbath a real sabbath, ye shall not see the Father." "Wherever there are (two), they are not without God, and wherever there is one alone, I say, I am with

[1] Acts xx. 35.

him. Raise the stone, and there thou shalt find me ; cleave the wood, and there am I." " (Ye ask ? who are those) that draw us (to the kingdom if) the kingdom is in Heaven ? . . . the fowls of the air, and all the beasts that are under the earth or upon the earth, and the fishes of the sea, (these are they which draw) you, and the kingdom of Heaven is within you ; and whosoever shall know himself shall find it. (Strive therefore ?) to know yourselves, and ye shall be aware that ye are the sons of the (almighty ?) Father ; (and ?) ye shall know that ye are in (the city of God), and ye are (the city ?)." [1] In the Dialogue with Trypho Justin records two or three traditional details which have escaped the New Testament: That Jesus was born in a cave ; that as a carpenter He made ploughs and yokes ; that at His baptism a fire was kindled in the Jordan. The last of these is obviously a myth. The first may have arisen out of the LXX version of Isaiah xxxiii. 16, *οὗτος οἰκήσει ἐν ὑψηλῷ σπηλαίῳ πέτρας ἰσχυρᾶς*, the early Fathers being bent on finding in Christ a fulfilment of all the Old Testament scriptures. As to the other tradition, it may obviously be correct, but we do not know Justin's authority. Eusebius, the Church historian, preserves a few particulars falling within the scope of the *Acts*, but later than the lifetime of Jesus. And that is about all. If more had been known, I for one believe that it would have been preserved in one form or another. I hold that the canonical writers swept the field practically bare, and that despite the enigmatical and rhetorical comment of John, " There are also many other things which Jesus did, the which if they should be written every one, I suppose that even the world itself would not contain the books that should be written." [2] The anecdotes in the apocryphal Gospels are fables, many of them silly fables. Irenaeus, appealing to the authority of men who had been

[1] Published 1904. [2] John xxi. 25.

acquainted with John and other apostles, affirms that the ministry of Christ was prolonged till He was approaching the age of fifty.[1] Of such little value historically are the traditions carried down through other channels than the New Testament.[2]

From the obscure years of the period succeeding the life of Christ two or three traditions are reported by Eusebius, who relates that Thomas the Apostle sent to Edessa Thaddeus, an apostle and one of the seventy disciples; that James, the brother of the Lord, called "The Just," was in a popular tumult thrown down from a wing of the temple and beaten to death by a fuller's club (the authority for the story being Hegesippus); that Mark carried the Gospel to Alexandria. For Mark's mission there is ample room during the years between his abandonment of Paul, Acts xiii. 13, and the next mention of him as being with the great apostle during his Roman imprisonment, Col. iv. 10. But it is strange that an event of so great importance should have been ignored by Luke, who can scarcely have been ignorant of it, since he also was with Paul at the later time (Col. iv. 14). How could Mark and Luke be together without comparing notes? But no argument is more precarious than that from silence. Some doubt must be suggested by Luke's apparent ignorance, but there is fairly good evidence on the other side. If there is truth in the conjecture that *Acts* ends as it does because the author meant to carry on the history in a third volume, it may be that it was in his mind to turn back and pick up some of the threads which he had dropped in order not to interrupt his narrative of Paul's missions and captivity.

[1] *Against Heresies*, ii. 5.

[2] Mention ought to be made also of two well-known sayings attributed to our Lord, the several times quoted, "Be ye approved money-changers," and the words preserved by Origen, "He that is near me is near the fire [? Father], but he that is far from me is far from the kingdom."

During all these years the Church was sustained by the living voice, first of the actual disciples of the Lord, and then by the disciples of these. Even in the early part of the second century, when the Synoptic Gospels certainly, and the fourth Gospel probably, were already in existence, Papias could record his preference for oral tradition over written. When he came in contact with any one who had been in touch with the "elders," he says, he examined him as to the words of the elders, "What Andrew or what Peter said, what Philip, or Thomas, or James, or John, or Matthew, or any other of the Lord's disciples, what Aristion and John the Elder, the Lord's disciples say. For I did not suppose I should profit so much by books as by the living and abiding voice." This has often been educed as proof that Papias set little store by our present Gospels. Seeing how scanty are the fragments known to us of the Bishop of Hierapolis it is dangerous to speak positively, but we are informed by Eusebius, quoting Irenaeus, that he wrote in five books *Expositions of the Oracles of the Lord* (λογίων κυριακῶν ἐξηγήσεις), and the quotation above is from the preface, κατὰ τὸ προοίμιον τῶν αὐτοῦ λόγων). It would seem likely, therefore, that he was really commenting in some way on the Gospels, and that the books he disparaged were other compositions. But all that really matters for our present purpose is that even to his day the living voice was heard of the disciples of the Lord. And this was more effective for edification than any writing.

It is so now. To read a speech in a newspaper, however well reported, is not the same thing as listening to its original delivery. To read about Chatham or his son, even in the brilliant pages of Macaulay or Lord Rosebery, is not the same thing as a description (if only it were possible) from the lips of one who had seen and heard for himself. And the first generation of Christians had the advantage of the

living voice. It was a Peter, it was a John, it was one or other of the Twelve who spoke, who could say: "Thus and thus I saw, thus and thus I heard." It was a Stephen or a Philip from the Hellenists in Jerusalem, but taught by the Twelve. It was a Paul, to whom the risen Lord had appeared in person; it was the eloquent Apollos, instructed by Aquila and Priscilla, who had been instructed by Paul. And so the movement went on. The *Acts* tells us how, relating the story, as has been explained above, from a particular point of view. And all this activity, it must be remembered, was prior to the composition of the Gospels. The material was accumulating which was afterwards to be worked up to such good effect, and it was as the first witnesses and their immediate followers dropped off one by one, and the return of the Master was still delayed, that the necessity began to be felt of a permanent and authoritative account of the things which were surely believed by the community. Till the written Gospels became known and were received, the teaching was for the most part oral, though there were possibly documents in existence which were utilised, perhaps incorporated in the larger works. Such may have been the "Little Apocalypse" of Mark xiii. It is by no means certain (as Dr. Sanday has pointed out) that this Apocalypse ever did actually exist as a separate brochure, but it can be so easily detached from its context that the hypothesis is tempting. Still, we must be on our guard against accepting every tempting hypothesis as a demonstrated fact. A small amount of definite external testimony will sometimes suffice to upset a great deal of inference from internal criticism.

Among the living agents, besides the apostles, were the seven deacons, the evangelists, teachers and prophets, all members of the charismatic ministry. In later days it became necessary to devise some means of testing their

genuineness, and the *Didaché* lays down rules, arbitrary enough, for distinguishing a true prophet from a false. In St. Paul's missionary journeys he appointed presbyters in every church. Among their duties may have been the superintendence of the charities and other affairs of the community, the carrying on of communications with other churches, and the maintenance of a standard of doctrine. This last was exceedingly difficult, and was in fact one of the greatest problems of the age, as is proved by St. Paul's epistles.

We are thus brought to a mention of one of the most important factors to be taken into account in forming a picture of the time. Especially in the churches of his own foundation, Paul's letters must have been of enormous weight. In the mother church of Jerusalem his influence was apparently almost *nil*, in spite of the collection for the poor saints which he so zealously promoted in the Gentile congregations. At Antioch emissaries who claimed the authority of James, the Lord's brother, caused disturbance, and in the churches of Galatia similar troubles arose. Nor is this to be wondered at in view of Paul's attitude to the Mosaic Law. I believe those critics (principally German) to be in error, who discover a flat contradiction between Paul's relations to the Law, as described in his own epistles, and his relations as described in *Acts*. This is not the place to enter upon a fresh examination of this much debated point. It must suffice to say that the account of Paul's conduct with the four men who had a vow upon them in Acts xxi. is fully explicable in view of those places in the epistles where he boasts of his Jewish descent, and especially of 1 Corinthians ix. 20 : "To the Jews I became as a Jew, that I might gain Jews ; to them that are under the law, as under the law, not being myself under the law, that I might gain them that are under the law." His position was open to mis-

understanding, but to a dispassionate observer it is quite intelligible. He held that in Christ the Law had found its goal, and was henceforth not obligatory, having lost its effect. It was by no means to be imposed on Gentile converts to Christianity. On this point he was adamant. But Jewish converts, to whom it was second nature, might continue to observe it so long as they imposed no disabilities on the Gentiles because of their non-observance. Peter's mistake at Antioch, for which Paul "resisted him to the face, because he stood condemned," was that having first eaten with Gentiles he afterwards, on the arrival of certain who came from James, separated himself, and even (so it is alleged) sought to make the Gentiles Judaise. In Paul's own words, publicly addressed to his brother apostle, "If thou, being a Jew, livest as do the Gentiles, and not as do the Jews, how compellest thou the Gentiles to live as do the Jews?" (Gal. ii.). To one who is not bound by the iron chains of an inflexible theory, but is conversant with the give and take of actual life, all this is perfectly natural. Paul may not have been altogether logically consistent, but then he had not a logical mind, at least as we Westerns conceive it. Nothing could be more illogical to us than the Rabbinical arguments which to him were conclusive. His was a fiery spirit, rushing to determinations by intuition rather than by argument, but seeing clearly enough that however devotedly Jewish converts might be attached to the Law, the imposition of its yoke on the Gentiles would be fatal to the propagation of the Gospel. This was a position not likely to be acceptable in Jerusalem, or indeed among Jewish Christians anywhere. In theory it might be admitted, as it was by the original apostles, but its great advocate and champion, who was revolutionising the Church with his multitudes of converts from among the Gentiles, was too overpowering for them. In Jewish-Christian

quarters the apostle of the Gentles could not be popular.

In the wider field of Gentile Christianity Paul's influence was great. But his authority was not unquestioned. The Epistles to the Corinthians introduce us to the schisms arising in that Church through the parties who attached themselves to various leaders, and also to the difficulty which Paul experienced in enforcing his decision on a question of plain morality, a question on which it ought never to have been necessary for him to speak at all. The Corinthian Church retained the same character of intractability long after Paul's death, as is evident from the *Epistle of Clement* addressed from Rome to that Church towards the end of the century. Yet after allowing for all this, Paul's was the predominant influence among the Gentile Christians, that is in the larger and more progressive part of the Church. One may assert this without implying that the ideas for which he stood were peculiar to himself and his immediate disciples. "Paulinism" is a real element in the New Testament, but it is conspicuous apart from Paul's epistles, and is only one part of the Church's life coming to the front, and getting a distinctive label.

There is another feature of Paul's teaching which is worthy of notice here, and that is the little emphasis which is laid on the life of Jesus. The epistles assume the Incarnation; they build on the Crucifixion and Resurrection, these are the all-important factors in Paul's scheme of doctrine; but all that lies between, if we except the Last Supper (and this is not really an exception) is ignored. The incidents of the earthly life are not recalled; there is not a distant reference to a parable or a miracle. It looks as though in his intercourse with those who had been with Jesus Paul never cared to inquire about anything that happened before the closing scenes in Jerusalem. How strange that seems to us who are tormented by the desire to know what Jesus

really did, what He really said! In his work, admirably translated under the title: *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*,[1] Dr. A. Schweitzer gives us an account of a portentous number of attempts to write the Life of Christ. So far as we can judge, Paul cared for none of these things. Even in the references to the Death and Resurrection, his whole interest lies in their sacrificial and propitiatory value. His mind is engrossed with the glorified Christ who is soon to return; forgetting the things that are behind, he presses on to the things that are to come. It is not possible to explain his silence by the assumption that his churches were so well acquainted with the facts that there was no need to recall them. The allusions in his epistles are sufficiently clear as to what his oral instruction included, and there is no indication that he ever touched on what we think so valuable. Baptism, the Eucharist, atonement, forgiveness, restoration, future judgment, the life of the world to come, that is, the matters of practical concern for man as a spiritual being—these were the warp and woof of his instruction. The details of the Lord's life on earth did not interest him. He is as silent on these as he is on the natural beauties and grandeurs of the country through which he passes on his journeys. He cares neither for biography nor scenery. His concern is with the souls of men. His business is to preach the Gospel.

In his doctrine is the germ of the Creeds, even of the so-called Athanasian Creed. I believe that if the greatest apostle could have been confronted with a copy of the "Quicunque vult," he would have been puzzled and horrified; puzzled as to the distinction between *substance* and *person*, with the other metaphysical subtleties; horrified that man should so use his measuring rod on the Deity.

[1] London, 1910.

"Let lore of all Theology
Be to thy soul what it *can* be:
But know—the Power that fashions man
Measured not out thy little span
For thee to take the meting-rod
In turn, and so approve on God
Thy science of Theometry."

But granting the data assumed by Paul (not that they were peculiar to him), it was inevitable that questions should arise as to the being of God, and as to the relations of the Son and the Spirit to the Father. And when they arose, and were answered, it was inevitable that the Church should indicate what answer seemed to her most nearly in accordance with Holy Scripture. And—apart from the anathemas, the "warning clauses" as it is now the fashion to call them —this is all that the *Quicunque vult* does. No doubt it is much to be regretted that the mind of man ever insisted on exploring these regions, and on drawing logical conclusions from such data, but the conclusions cannot be denied without invalidating the data, though, as I have already said, it is questionable whether Paul (not having a logical mind) would have recognised the deductions. And it is much more to be regretted that an intolerant age added the clauses which lead in our more enlightened days to special pleading which brings on its practisers the charge of being either muddle-headed or dishonest. At all events, in the churches of Paul's foundation, when the Gospels were brought they would find a ready reception from those who had already been orally instructed in the doctrines which later hardened into the dogmas of the Church. And to a great extent this must have been true of the other churches as well. Divergent as Paul and the original apostles were in many ways, they were fundamentally at one in their conception of the person of Christ. The universal acquiescence in the supreme authority of the canonical Gospels shews this. In course of

time all rivals vanished, only the four were left. This did not mean a great revolution in Christianity; it meant only an evolution of the Christianity existing before the Gospels. Of the Gospels the simplest, the most natural, as well as the earliest, is *Mark*. As is well known, the proper ending to this Gospel is lost, that which appears in our English Bible being a later addition or substitute. It is impossible now to say what was the real cause of the mutilation, and whether it was by accident or design, but the suspicion suggests itself that Mark may have ended his work with some statement that was not acceptable to the Church, and that rather than allow its circulation, the Church cancelled it. The result was a maimed story, but that may have been thought to be better than one which was judged erroneous. The cancelling would not have been the decision of a council, or of any properly constituted and representative authority, it would be the unofficial act of some who felt themselves sufficiently in touch with the Christian consciousness to be sure of what would offend. But this is the purest conjecture.

As to the way of life of Christians before the Gospels, what Luke in the early chapters of Acts relates about the Church in Jerusalem is, *mutatis mutandis*, true of other Churches also. Only in Jerusalem could daily attendance at the Temple be practised, but as long as it was possible to do so the Jews who became Christians continued to worship with their former co-religionists. They did not at first regard themselves as having ceased to be Jews, but as having found the long-promised Messiah in Jesus. But the Gentile converts were in different case, and the worship which was common to them and the Jewish Christians must have been leading up to the final breach with Judaism which was effected by the catastrophe of A.D. 70. All the churches alike "continued steadfastly in the apostles' teach-

ing and fellowship, in the breaking of bread and the prayers." The last clause evidently indicates the beginning of liturgical worship, traces of which possibly survive in other places in the New Testament, as there are also traces of hymnody. For the latter the reader may refer, e.g., to Ephesians v. 14, as it is printed in the Greek Testaments of Westcott and Hort or of Nestle. The first clause is a confirmation of what has been already urged with regard to the general recognition of our present Gospels. They would not have triumphed over all rivals if their doctrine had differed from that handed down from the apostles.

The charismatic ministry found its counterpart in some of the congregations. Those are strange scenes of disorder to which we are introduced by the rebukes and instructions of 1 Corinthians xii. and xiv. The historical book of Acts passes over all such phenomena in silence, but in the light of what has occurred at similar times of religious excitement in later ages, one can form a picture of the scenes. The rhapsody, even frenzy, into which the excitable Corinthians fell, has been many times paralleled. No doubt the unhealthy state of mind indicated by the phenomena was also accountable for the disorders at the Love Feast and the Lord's Supper which are so sternly rebuked earlier in the same epistle. The glossolalia of Corinth is probably the phenomenon which underlies also the curious relation in *Acts* of the signs which accompanied the outpouring of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost. As told to Luke, and repeated by him, the story was that the disciples received the power of speaking divers languages without the trouble of learning them; but firstly, there is no hint elsewhere of such a power being exercised; and secondly, most, if not all, of those present at the scene would have some acquaintance with the common language, Greek. Greek was the medium of mission preaching and instruction afterwards, as it was also the medium used

in writing. Dr. Adolf Deissmann has made it abundantly clear that there is no such thing as a special Biblical Greek; what used to be so called is nothing but the international language, the κοινή, which was the means of communication right round the Mediterranean. The speaking with tongues at Pentecost was assuredly the same phenomenon as was subsequently witnessed in Corinth, but it is not on record as a permanent characteristic of the Jerusalem Church. Whether it appeared in other congregations than the Corinthian is not said, but there would be nothing surprising if it did.

The ordinary Christian worship of his own day, c. 150 A.D., is described by Justin Martyr, and the description may well be applicable to the epoch now under review. There were four elements in the worship—which, by the way, took place "on the day of the sun"—and these were the reading of the memoirs of the apostles, or the writings of the prophets, the delivery of an exhortation by the "president," then prayer said in common (and therefore presumably according to some set form), and lastly the partaking of bread and of wine mingled with water. Christians who were not present shared in the Eucharist through the elements being carried to them by the deacons.[1] Such has Christian worship been all through the centuries. There is no actual description of it in *Acts* or the Epistles, but the general lines must always have been much the same.

In morals the rules of the primitive Church were identical with the rules of the Church now, but in practice it has always been difficult to prevent the Christian society from contamination by the outside world. The notorious case at Corinth, where a Christian married his step-mother, is denounced by Paul as worse than anything that could have been sanctioned among the heathen, and his grief is intensified

[1] 1 *Apolog.* 67.

by the complacency of the culprit's fellow-Christians, who did not take steps to rid the Church of the scandal, and were not even shocked by it. This callousness can be easily explained by the general atmosphere of Corinth, the licentiousness of which was notorious. It was difficult for converts always to realise that practices to which they had been accustomed all their lives were abominable sins. Identical difficulties confront missionaries among the more degraded races to-day. We do not read of similar lapses elsewhere, but a part of the decree of the Council of Jerusalem (Acts xv. 29), as well as admonitions in the epistles, is directed against sins of the flesh. The teaching of Jesus, too, on this subject was carefully treasured up, and found its way into the Gospels. The question cannot be here discussed whether Jesus did or did not allow of the exception "for fornication" to His law of the indissolubility of marriage, but it may be remarked that the criticism which excises these words from Matthew v. 32 (the clause is: "clearly an interpolation" in xix. 9[1]) may be directed with greater force against the mention of the Trinity in xxviii. 19. But both of these, though denied to Jesus, may nevertheless be integral portions not only of what Dr. Hort called "the extant form or edition of the first Gospel," but of the original. The one may have arisen in the Church from the experience of the hard facts of life during these obscure years, the other from the lofty Christology of St. Paul. The full baptismal formula meets us in the *Didaché* towards the end of the century; but unfortunately the *Didaché* is not a witness to an independent tradition, since it is judged to make use of *Matthew*.

The period that we have been discussing must have been a period of transition. At its beginning oral teaching, buttressed possibly by manuscript notes, was sufficient to meet

[1] See W. C. Allen *in loco*. *Internat. Critical Comm.*

the needs of the Church. But as converts came in in growing numbers, and as the original witnesses and their immediate disciples simultaneously became less available, written sources were increasingly drawn upon, and acquired greater importance. The occasional letters of Paul and other writers were circulated, and copies were acquired for churches other than those to which they were first addressed. But to follow this thread would lead to a discussion of the formation of the Canon of the New Testament, and carry us far beyond the limits of our time and subject. The aim of this paper has been to draw attention to the long gap between the historic life of Jesus and the writing of the only records of it which have survived, and at the same time to point to reasons which make it probable that the teaching of the Gospels was not a new importation, but, so to say, a stereotyping of the Christianity existing before their composition. One cannot but wish that an account had been preserved of the arrival of the earliest canonical Gospel in, say, Jerusalem, and of the eager discussion and comparison of memories which its reading must have evoked. But as to all that, history is blank, and only imagination is available. To picture what may have happened is an attractive, but not always a profitable, venture ; it will not be attempted here.

G. E. Ffrench.

STUDIES IN CHRISTIAN ESCHATOLOGY.

IV. Death and the Sequel.

On any view not constructed to omit plain facts, death is an episode of inexpressible meaning. Of many people, not less brave or sensible than their neighbours, it would be true to say that death is never out of their minds ; of others it may be asserted that the most real thing they ever do, and the saddest, is to lie down and die. In the great literature of the world death stands as the last sombre enigma, before which man halts in dumb anguish or proud defiance, resenting its approach as that of a cruel and unnatural intruder, even when it closes a long happy life. Contemplated at this angle, which is that of the vast majority of the human race, it is the focus of tragedy, the one incalculable woe, giving the lie to secular optimism of every kind. Death, in short, is a reality so towering that shelter from it can be found in neither words nor silence. And men whose faith entitles them to assign it an ultimate value, thus subsuming it under universal purpose, possess an inestimable advantage, alike in life and argument, over all for whom it is the synonym of ruin.

The traditional interpretation of death, in Christian theology, makes it a penalty consequent on the Fall. This is probably accepted as it stands by comparatively few living thinkers. A modern view, which owes much to Ritschl, pleads that for redeemed men death no longer contains any punitive quality ; it has lost the character of *evil* for the Christian mind, inasmuch as it once for all liberates the renewed spirit from every mundane impediment or burden. This has often been denounced as facile, but it has a close similarity to some beautiful words of the Westminster Longer Catechism. " The righteous," we there read, " shall

be delivered from death itself at the last day, and even in death are delivered from the sting and curse of it ; so that, although they die, yet it is out of God's love, to free them perfectly from sin and misery, and to make them capable of further communion with Christ in glory." Ritschl and the Westminster divines would agree, no doubt, in holding that death is punitive for men who have not faith. That is beyond dispute ; the case is one in which a thing simply is what it is felt to be, and it is undeniable that for those who put Christ aside the threatening and lamentable aspect of death remains. But is it punitive in any sense for Christians ?

The punitive quality, if present, can be present only in subordination to higher truth. According to a great Pauline word, death is swallowed up in victory. And yet, even for a Christian, it is laden with the significant tokens and memorials of sin. To the very end, as one has said, it is a voice that speaks of responsibility. When to men of believing temper it has seemed a horror, an indignity, the last enemy, the king of terrors ; when they have anticipated with solemn feeling the last indescribable sinking of nature, the overshadowing fear, the rending of the roots of being—this is not the result merely of weak faith or beclouded insight. It is in part a just conviction that such an exit from the world does not perfectly become children of a Heavenly Father. Thus something of chastisement remains even for the faithful. It is not penalty for them as it is for one who cannot perceive Divine love in it ; for they have been pardoned, and the guilt to which alone punishment proper is relative has been cancelled and put away. But enough of weakness and corruption is in it to keep us humble, and in the noblest triumph over death is an under-current of trembling confession. There is a stooping of the soul to a law of the Divine working : " Every

branch that beareth fruit, He purgeth it, that it may bring forth more fruit." And thus all that may be felt of appointed correction in the last earthly experience is overcome and transcended not by the daring stretch of imagination that looks beyond it, or the Stoic apathy that will not acknowledge its reality, but in the lowliness of trust which says, "Though He slay me, yet will I trust Him." Very specially it is overcome through union with One who, when tasting death for every man, passed beyond the bitter cry of desolation to quiet words of self-committal into the Father's hand.

Thus death and dying will always be a theme for the Christian preacher. It is the one form of suffering no one can escape, and which it is sentimentalism to ignore. No preacher intent upon reality can ever forget those who think of death as a lonely voyage into utter darkness. These he will strive to enlighten as to its meaning for their relationship to God; it will be his aim to bring them out of levity or despair into triumphant hope. But not less plainly he will speak of its deep promise to faith, of its significance as the final task appointed by the Father, the summons to Christ's weary soldiers, the great transition that sets free the hidden powers of the soul. It must be shown that even death is gain. "To be with Christ, which is *far* better"—it is not in every mood, or at every stage of life, that we can say this either to others or to ourselves. Yet there comes to believing men a settled temper in which they can say it—can say nothing else, indeed, as the infinite prospect rises up before them.

The Intermediate State was a subject of anxious questioning in circles of primitive Christianity, and this anxiety St. Paul felt it quite worth while to treat considerately. He would not brush it aside as a foolish curiosity; as

he could, he dealt with it. The dead, he wrote to his converts, have no more than the living passed out of a saved relationship to the Lord. They are not far from Christ; they are with Him, for at the last He will *bring* them to meet the survivors. This is a note which recurs in the Pauline writings. From a Saviour like his St. Paul anticipated nothing but the best and highest. God, he knew, would not bid him be satisfied with partial or piecemeal redemption. When he is moving at the supreme height of faith, and looking across the gulf of death, he sees life full, immediate, and everlasting in company with Christ. Reunion with Him fills the prospect. This incontestably makes an impression very unlike that left by various shadowy suggestions often put forward in later times, to the effect that the soul, between death and judgment, must traverse an indefinite period of maturing or purifying, as an indispensable preparation for direct vision of God. Quite apart from Roman ideas of purgatory,[1] the notion is tolerably familiar in Protestant books that the departed spirit, to be presentable before God, is bound to undergo, after death, a certain process of resting or ripening. In the Father's house is a vestibule, and there the new guests must

[1] As to the Romish purgatory an incisive writer has said: "The object of detention there is not to teach wisdom by suffering, or to train weak wills towards good. The will of the "holy souls," it is expressly taught, is already from the moment of death perfectly fixed towards good. You can no more sin in Purgatory than you can sin in Paradise. The only object of Purgatory is to be not purgative, but simply retributory; you are paid out there for sins for which you have not paid a sufficient mulct in temporal suffering before death" (A. E. Taylor, in *Mind*, for July, 1912). This is put somewhat too sharply. To say that "the only object of Purgatory is to be not purgative but simply retributory" does not represent quite accurately the tone of Roman dogma. Thus in a Bull of Eugenius IV (1431–1447) it is declared: *Si vere poenitentes in Dei caritate decesserint, antequam dignis poenitentiae fructibus de commissis satisfecerint et omissis, eorum animas poenis purgatoriis post mortem purgari,* where the purgative character is plainly asserted. Still, the emphasis is almost wholly laid where Professor Taylor lays it.

wait awhile. Is not this one more instance of unwillingness to believe that in Christ we are offered a complete salvation ? Does not the sudden insertion of a preparatory time imply that grace is conditioned in God's offer of it by man's ethical achievement, and even in a sense that we shall actually be further from Him then than now ? Now, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ ; then, there will be felt barriers and partitions. Any one who believes that men are forgiven only in so far as they are forgivable, that redemption is something provisional and as it were divisible, and dependent on rather than creative of the holiness of the receiver, will no doubt find it a natural thing that Christian souls should mature in a place of preparation, as not being fit to meet God instantly. But in this what most strikes one is its unlikeness to the New Testament. The glory of the authentic Gospel is that the love of God does not wait upon our fitness. It gives all, and only gives, and by this giving in lavishness and without calculation it makes men like itself. " Fitness " is a thought born of morality, not religion ; and neither in this life nor the next can the believer accept it as indicating or controlling the relation of the Father's mercy to human need.

There emerges at this point the old problem whether we can regard it as really credible that " the souls of believers are, at their death, made perfect in holiness." [1] Many people, in view of the short limits of our knowledge, ask themselves whether this has any reality that our minds can apprehend. Are not the probabilities all in favour of saying that we shall start again very much where we left off here ? How is it thinkable that the long work of sanctification, advanced on earth but a little way in many years, should complete itself fortuitously and in a moment ? Was the dying thief made perfect in an hour ? What we know of

[1] *Westminster Shorter Catechism*, qu. 37.

moral life, and of the normal changes by which it is qualified, lead us rather to believe that the interrupted task will be resumed at the point of interruption, but under conditions more hopeful by far. In particular, is there anything in the mere fact of death to induce a change so abrupt, so radical, so permanent ?

Let us concede for a moment the force of these reasons, and ask only what then is before us. Apparently a second life which in essential quality repeats the life of earth. There, as here, it is clearly implied, we may look for effort and aspiration ; with a measure of attainment, no doubt, but also with failure, discontent, and the same underflow of rebellion against relativity and frustration as darkens much of the present. There, as here, we shall have a struggle to wage between the Divine Will and evil powers operating in ourselves at least, if not also in the environment. Hope will still be set upon an infinitely distant goal, and this goal will form, as now, the natural termination of a process of moral and social evolution. If the Christian consciousness of to-day is satisfied with a future life of this character, one can only say that it is much altered since St. Paul's day. Nothing in such a prospect could ever awake a joy unspeakable and full of glory. Nothing in it could lead an apostle to speak of it, in words quivering with passion, as radiant transformation into the very image of Christ. " As man grows spiritually," says Tyrrell, " he asks more and not less." He asks, indeed, a transcendent order of experience, in which desires after holiness shall be satisfied ; " in which sorrow, pain, temptation and sin shall be done away ; in which the struggle shall be explained, justified, and brought to eternal rest." [1] In short, a heaven which is earth over again—with evil, therefore with conflict, with conflict, therefore with possible defeat—is radically unequal to the pre-

[1] *Christianity at the Cross-roads*, 125–6.

monitions of Christian faith. It is discredited from the very outset by the mere fact that we can conceive what is far better.

Moreover, it will not do to speak of death solely as a physical episode, with the view of disparaging its alleged purifying power. As Moberly has pointed out, we simply do not yet know the possibilities of humbling and cleansing discipline which may lie hid within the experience of dying.[1] It must be considered that by death the soul passes into a life of felt nearness to God perhaps as much transcending the loftiest hours of earthly devotion as these do the first faint movements of faith in a young convert, and that death would not be death which did not abolish the tempting influence of the flesh. In the light of these presumptive facts, the suggestion that beyond the grave believers may find themselves at once above sin's reach will not appear so precarious. Cases are known in which men and women have been once for all delivered from the tyranny of a particular besetting sin through a sudden awakening to the gracious presence of God. Is it incredible that unimaginably close fellowship with Christ, made possible within the veil, may kill all sin then and there? Attained sinlessness is not, of course, equivalent to perfection. Much may rather be said for the position that it is only on the basis of sinless life that progress towards perfection can begin.

The most formidable objection to older views on this point is directed to the notion of sanctification as completed at a stroke, but this point is, I think, fairly met by a further argument. On any theory which does not hold that sin in the redeemed is everlasting, it is difficult to see how sudden and catclysmic moral transformation *somewhere* is avoided. Let the soul carry over sinful tendencies into the new life, and even there it has nothing more in front of it than a

[1] *Atonement and Personality*, 114.

progressus in infinitum. Advance never ends in full realisation. If endeavour were ever to be crowned by perfect attainment, then, however brief the last stage, only a miracle could bring it to a close, which would be equally miraculous in the case of mature and of immature goodness. In brief, sinlessness at death is unquestionably a difficulty for thought, but the difficulty of sinfulness after death is, on the whole, much greater.

From the first the Church appears to have been in two minds respecting the immediate sequel of death for those who have not in this life attained to conscious fellowship with God. The veil drawn, in gospels and epistles, over the fortunes of such as have not faith is very dark. Yet by introducing, even in faint allusion, the thought of Jesus' mission to the dead,[1] the New Testament makes room for the hypothesis that death may not be for all the knell of opportunity. However obscure the Petrine words, they indicate that the notion of saving contact with Christ beyond the veil had crossed the writer's mind and not been rejected forthwith as unthinkable. Orthodox Protestantism, in righteous zeal against every view which makes the future of the soul dependent on the activities of an earthly priesthood, would hear of no reserves. The world to come is painted in two colours, pure white and black. Resistance to superstition has become rigid dogmatism. It was proclaimed as certain that the limits of God's love are known; that they are fixed, in the case of *all*, by the soul's attitude to God at death; and that whatever is possible, it is not possible that Christ should be revealed to any who have left this world devoid of conscious faith. This is a negative certitude to which no man has a right.

It is not surprising, therefore, that hopes of future pro-

[1] 1 Peter iii. 19; iv. 6.

bation for some lives should now prevail widely. By certain thinkers the occasion for such probation is placed just after individual death, by others at the ultimate manifestation of Christ; and since we are in complete ignorance whether future existence at all resembles the present in temporal quality, it is difficult to be sure that these views after all really diverge. At all events their divergence matters little; we are interested rather in their agreement that men who have not utterly rejected the Divine love, and therefore cannot be described as obstinately wicked, will after death hear the words of life and peace. The problem is clearly forced to the front by the felt lack of harmony between the universality of Christ's message and the fact that His Gospel, thus far, has been presented only to a fraction of the race. And relief is found in the faith that the resources of God are infinite. Heathen who have not heard Jesus' name, children who die young, imbecile minds, all those to whom the beauty of holiness has never been presented here—these, and others in like case, may look for something better than to be dismissed into the rayless night of perdition. The chance of being saved is still theirs, and for the Christian mind "salvation" has no apprehensible meaning except as it denotes a spiritual union with God, which is mediated through Jesus Christ. The attempt has occasionally been made to turn the edge of the argument as a whole by contending that even in this life all men do have the opportunity of identifying themselves with supreme goodness—that this indeed is plainly taught in the picture of Judgment with which Matthew xxv. closes. There, we are told, it is the Gentiles' record in this life which is made the touchstone of destiny. They had that in them, it is urged, which made its voice heard on behalf of goodness; and the way in which they have dealt with its appeal for those who needed services of love decides how it shall be

with them. Whether this is the true sense of the passage much depends on the prior question who are the subjects of judgment—all mankind, Christians, or the non-Christian world ; but apart from this, the suggested application leaves our feeling of justice disquieted. Surely the point is that if we say the heathen had their conscience, bidding them help the needy, and fixed their place in the eternal world by their response, yet we too had our conscience, making its appeal ; and what alone availed to break us down and change our heart was the direct presentation of Jesus, over and above. What might not they have become, had our additional privilege been theirs ? There is no obvious equality in conditions between those who are rejected on the score of failure to obey conscience and those who besides have felt the influence of a Person able to save to the uttermost. Let them meet Jesus, somehow and somewhere, let them feel the unique and amazing power to evoke faith which, as all believers know, resides in Him, and who shall say they too may not answer Him with trust and love ? And what is true of heathen lives is credible also in the case of others among ourselves who, so far from definitively rejecting Christ, have, through the apathy of His followers, missed all real contact with His grace.

It is said that any such hypothesis must destroy the value of preaching, but the truth of this is far from evident. We are not now considering those who have distinctly faced the Gospel, set forth in Christian lives or worthy evangelism, and as distinctly have put it aside, not because they failed to understand it, but because they understood it only too well. What is now said gives no colour to the suggestion that in the next life all men, without exception, will find a doorway open into the love of God. Nothing certainly could be more unlike the apostolic message. It is impossible to conceive a preacher deeply conscious of his obliga-

tions, yet exerting himself to persuade men that nothing is decided in this life, that we are not choosing to-day what shall be in the great to-morrow. To hold such language is to discount the moral solemnity of actual experience. If anything is certain, it is that procrastination in religion, the wish to postpone decision for God to an easier day, makes it harder than ever to part with evil. It is deliberate choice of an illusion which even this life will unmask; is there any reason why it should be different on the other side of death? No; what we most need to have developed in us is the certainty that God is here and now. "He cannot ever be nearer us than He is, though we shall realise Him better. We are as much in eternity to-day as we shall ever be, though one day we shall know what now we dimly feel." The Christian preacher, therefore, ought to be anxious about his hearers. If he feels as St. Paul felt, he will be afraid of what may come to those who turn away from Jesus and repel the great spiritual world of love and life and truth that lies around us, waiting to break in and transmute our souls. But the fullest recognition of this may be combined with the hope, or even the conviction, that Christ will one day be presented, for acceptance or rejection, to those who have not been permitted to know Him here. Those who cherish this hope—which, it need hardly be said, they are unwilling to put as a dogma—cannot admit that what they believe in is properly designated a "second" probation. At least, if the probation vouchsafed to Christians is defined by both things, the appeal of conscience and of Christ; if it is only because they have responded to Jesus that in the end they are able to stand before God, then a large class must exist who have not traversed *this* probation even once. "Future" probation we may rightly say, but not "second."

In conclusion, a single word may be added in regard to prayers for the dead. It is easy to understand opposition to the practice if we place ourselves at the point of view of the Reformers, and it is doubtful whether any Protestant writer of standing can be found to maintain the possibility of abridging by earthly intercession the purifying pains of departed saints. There are many, however, to whom traffic in masses for the departed is abhorrent, who yet see no cause to fix a point, even at death, where they must cease praying for loved friends now with Christ. While no one would claim first-rate importance for the question as a whole, it is interesting to ask what are the considerations which influence most defenders of the custom in their advocacy of it. Broadly speaking, their case is based on Pascal's well-known dictum that the heart has its reasons which the mind cannot understand.

Thus it is often held that prayers for the dead are meaningless, since we know not what to pray for. Our wishes may be out of all relation to the conditions under which the departed live. It is of course easy to conceive petitions to which this objection is fatal. But those of whom I am thinking would reply that it is scarcely relevant, for example, to a prayer that the departed may be near Christ and may know ever more of His glory. If it be replied that to ask even so much as this is to exhibit distrust of God, the answer has been returned that, if pressed, this at bottom would be an objection to intercession as such, since the perfect and infinite care of God is the presupposition of all prayer for others. But in neither case need any disposition be shown to dictate to God how He shall translate our wish into bestowal.

Further, prayer for the departed has been defended on the ground that it is contained by implication in prayer for the whole Church of God. If we take seriously our professed belief in one family in heaven and earth, by what

right (it is asked) shall we draw a line of division between those within this family who may be prayed for, and others who may not ? May it not be maintained that the instincts or intuitions of the Christian heart refuse to acknowledge such a line, and that dogmatic theory must be called in to silence them ? If the perfect Kingdom has not yet supervened, it is possible that some ultimate consummation still awaits even those who are with Jesus. When we pray for the completion of the Church in glory, can we omit saints within the veil from our forward view ? If they have gone before, and await our coming, it will be asked in all sincerity what harm it can do to pray God that their unfulfilled desires may be crowned with fruition. So the Prayer-book gives thanks " for all who have departed this life in God's faith and fear ; beseeching Him to give us grace so to follow their good examples, that with them we may be partakers of His heavenly kingdom." And here the whole, it is said, must include the part.

Another point made by advocates of the practice may be stated more or less as follows. They would maintain with profound conviction that it is impossible to think simultaneously of dear dead friends and of God without such a mental movement or transition as is equivalent to prayer. Thought in such a case is not thanksgiving merely, it cannot but be also intercession and commendation. It might be a final step in this argument to hold that even impugners of the custom under review may have their position refuted by a closer scrutiny of their own minds. Perhaps by nearer inspection they may observe their own thought moving implicitly in the way now described ; and nothing embraced in the instinctive motion of the Christian soul is altered in meaning or value by being made explicit. These are, on the whole, the more important considerations which have figured in the discussion.

The issue, presumably, is one not so much for theoretic argument as for the most private and spiritual feeling. In any case, we may be sure men will decide it for themselves; and hearts overburdened with grief, as they follow the dead into the world of light with longing unspeakable, will not inquire closely, or too much care, what rules of prayer have been devised by men whose minds are cast in another mould. To the demand that they must set limits to intercession they will be apt to reply that they cannot break off the utterance of fond wishes at the grave. To them it seems merely natural that at will they should speak to the Father concerning those whom He has in His safe keeping.

> Who shall forbid the heart's desires to flow
> Beyond the limit of the things we know?
> In heaven above
> The incense that the golden censers bear
> Is the sweet perfume from the saintly prayer
> Of trust and love.[1]

H. R. Mackintosh.

RELIGION AND PHILOSOPHY.

In its modern form the question of the relation of religion to philosophy was first raised by Kant and Schleiermacher—by the former from the side of philosophy, by the latter from the side of religion. Against the Rationalism of the 18th century, which had made religion dependent on metaphysic, Kant demonstrated the impossibility of any theoretical or speculative knowledge of the ultimate realities on which religion hangs. Detaching religion from metaphysic, he grounded it in man's moral consciousness, in other words, in ethics. The ideas in which it moves are postulates of our moral consciousness, as certain to us as the fact of moral

[1] *Poems*, by Walter C. Smith, p. 175.

obligation ; and we are religious when we fulfil the duties imposed upon us by our moral reason as at the same time divine commands.

Equally with Kant, Schleiermacher was concerned to loose religion from its dependence on philosophical speculation. But he took a further and much more dubious step when he sought to demonstrate its independence of morality as well. According to this epoch-making theologian, religion is an ultimate function of the human spirit, distinct alike from philosophical knowing and ethical doing, and in no way an appendix of one or the other. It is the feeling or sense of the Infinite in the finite, the Eternal in the temporal, the Whole in the part ; the feeling that our time-life, with all that comes within its experience, is a manifestation and organ of the eternal Whole and absolutely dependent on it. That religion involves knowledge or doctrine Schleiermacher admitted ; but such knowledge, he affirmed, relates only to the various ways in which the religious consciousness is determined, and is not derived from any source outside that consciousness. It may be remarked that in opposing the Rationalistic conception of the dependence of religion on speculation, both Kant and Schleiermacher equally opposed the traditional Church conception of its dependence on a body of supernaturally revealed truth.

There is probably no one to-day who would maintain the theories of either Kant or Schleiermacher in their entirety. None the less these theories mark a notable advance in the understanding of religion. Their demonstration that the religious impulse is radically distinct from the speculative, and that religion does not wait on speculation for its knowledge of ultimate truth—that, I believe, stands and will stand. And equally irrefragable is the Kantian position that religion, in its higher forms at least, is inseparably bound up with our moral consciousness.

Where both of these great thinkers fall short is in their analysis of religion, their conception of what religion essentially is. Neither the one nor the other had before him religion as it has been exhibited by the outstanding prophetic spirits of our race. Kant knew it only in a miserably truncated form, as an appendix of morality ; and for Schleiermacher it was hardly more than an emotional apprehension and appreciation of the unity of the universe.

If we can claim for Albrecht Ritschl that he lifted the whole subject to a new level, his success is due far less to his philosophic penetration, for which he was not conspicuous, than to his deeper understanding of the impulses from which religion springs and the interests to which it ministers. It would not be easy to sum up Ritschl's position in a few sentences, and the attempt is the less necessary that the discussion which follows is substantially on Ritschlian lines.

Before entering on a consideration of the relation of religion to philosophy it is necessary to determine what these two great magnitudes severally represent. From what root in human nature do they spring ? What human need do they seek to satisfy ? The definition of philosophy is perhaps the simpler task, and with it we shall begin.

We may count on fairly general agreement when we say that philosophy represents the attempt of the human mind to impose on the manifoldness of its experience the unity which it finds within itself. Proceeding on the assumption that things form a connected whole, it essays the task of exhibiting them in their organic relation to each other and building them into a system. The impulse from which it springs is thus purely intellectual in character. Like science it seeks to understand the universe ; only, raising questions that lie beyond the domain of science, it seeks to understand it in its ultimate principles.

This is not to be taken as meaning that the intellectual

interest is the only one to which philosophical constructions minister or by which their character is determined. As a matter of fact there has never been a system which has not to a greater or lesser extent been dominated by judgments of value—judgments, that is to day, regarding the worth or value which certain elements in experience possess for the human spirit. If Plato, for example, sets the Idea of the good at the apex of his system, it is not from any intellectual or logical demand, but because of the religious judgment that the good possesses a worth which entitles it to such a position. So far his system is determined by a religious motive and ministers to a religious interest. But while this must be affirmed, it still remains true that the characteristic task of philosophy is an intellectual one, to unify and organise. What is taken over from religion, like what is taken over from other departments of experience, is treated as an element that has to be built into a general scheme of things.,

Turn we now to religion. There are those who find at the basis of religion precisely the same intellectual impulse that, as we have seen, gives rise to philosophy. Religion, according to this account, represents the search of the mind for an ultimate cause ; or, again, as in the Hegelian and Neo-Hegelian philosophy, it is rooted in the impulse to discover a unity that shall comprehend and explain all distinctions, more especially the distinction of subject and object. The idea of an absolute Unity, Edward Caird asserts, is the ultimate and essential principle of our intelligence, and as such the ultimate principle of religion. Every rational being as such is a religious being. Wherein then do religion and philosophy differ, for that there is a difference is an undeniable historical fact ? The difference is reduced to this, that while the first attains the goal by a kind of intuition, the second proceeds by the path of rational demonstration. Needless

to say it is the latter path that in the estimation of Idealistic thinkers is the more certain one, and the one to which all men will in time betake themselves. Religion is relegated to the position of a forecourt of philosophy.

To me it seems difficult to find in such an analysis a single grain of anything that can be called truth. If there is one thing that stands out in religion through all its stages it is its practical character. Religion, as it presents itself to us as an historical phenomenon, is rooted, not in the impulse to find a cause that shall explain the world, nor in the impulse to pass beyond all antitheses to the unity that embraces them, but in man's practical situation and in the practical needs of his life. It has what we may call its natural basis in our sense of dependence on a power above us, however we may name it, a power which besets us behind and before, breaks in upon our life at every point, often in staggering enough ways, and which we cannot escape. So to relate ourselves to this power as that it shall not be against us but with us, is one of the great practical needs that in all ages have impelled men to religion. But this, of course, does not carry us far. Only when we enter the domain of man's moral life do the profounder needs to which religion ministers disclose themselves. Kant was right in asserting that religion is bound up with our consciousness of moral obligation. Its deepest root is the impulse to establish at the heart of things, on the throne of being, those great moral sanctities that impose upon us a limitless obligation and bow us before them in profoundest reverence. The God whom religion seeks is not the One in the many, not the Absolute, but the Almighty Power whose loving kindness is in the heavens, whose faithfulness reacheth unto the skies, whose righteousness is like the mountains of God, whose judgments are a great deep. And that communion with God in which religion lives is communion with the Being

who stands behind these sanctities as their source and their guardian.

This then is our first result, that religion and philosophy spring from radically different impulses of our human nature and minister to different needs. The first, in its highest form, arises as an answer to the demand that the moral sanctities of our life be established as the ultimate and supreme reality ; the second as an answer to the demand for a completely unified and organised experience.

We pass to another point. Whence does religion derive its knowledge of God ? On what is our belief that God is such as our Christian faith represents Him to be ultimately founded ? It is the great question of revelation, or, viewing the matter from the philosophic standpoint, the question of epistemology.

According to the traditional Church view, common alike to Catholics and Protestants, reason supplies us with certain elementary truths about God, and revelation supplements these with a number of supernaturally communicated and authenticated truths of a higher order. I shall not stay to criticise that view. Enough to say that it lies behind us. Our concern is with the claim often advanced on behalf of philosophy, that religion is in the last resort dependent for its knowledge of God on a philosophic construction. There is, it is often maintained, but one pathway to truth, the pathway of reason ; and philosophy represents the attempt of the human mind to apply reason to the problems of existence in a systematic way.

Now if by reason we are to understand the sum of our cognitive faculties, the claim that it is the one organ of truth can scarcely be contested except by one who occupies the ground of the older and discredited supernaturalism. But can we speak of reason as a uniform process ? Has the human mind only one way of reaching truth ? Or if more

than one, must all be regarded as variants of a single type ?

To Kant we owe the earliest attempt to distinguish between the cognitive process represented in science and philosophy and that represented in religion. The former process he describes as that of the theoretical, and the latter as that of the practical reason ; and he lays it down that the theoretical reason has as its proper domain the world of phenomena, the domain of ultimate or noumenal reality lying outside its competence. All our religious ideas are postulates of the practical reason, that is to say, they are implied in our consciousness of moral obligation, and are valid only for those who acknowledge such obligation to be impregnably real. We cannot linger to point out the strength and the weakness of this epistemology. The further development of the distinction established proceeded along other than Kantian lines. In the hands of Herbart, De Wette, Lotze, Ritschl, Kaftan and others it became a distinction between theoretical judgments on the one side and judgments of value on the other.

What, according to this account of our cognitive processes, is a theoretical judgment ? It is one that has as the ground of its validity the compulsion of perception and logical thought. Every scientific and every strictly philosophical judgment is theoretical in character. Starting from perceived particulars, the scientist and, in a larger way, the philosopher, proceed to the general conception that reduces these particulars to unity and order ; and they reach their goal when the whole world of known fact is causally or logically connected in a single organic system. The proof that their construction corresponds with reality lies simply in this, its ability to exhibit the facts in their interrelation and unity. It follows that the certainty with which such a construction is held is a purely logical certainty.

If such be the character of theoretical judgments and

theoretical constructions, what are judgments of value? We may define them as judgments that have as the ground of their validity, not the compulsion of perception or of logical thought, but the fact that the object about which the judgment is made possesses for us as beings endowed with feeling, desire, volition, a certain value or worth. When I say travel is pleasant I pronounce a judgment of value, or when I say the Venus of Milo is sublime, or again when I say thought is a noble activity. Such judgments have no meaning except for a being who is the subject of feeling and desire and who pursues ends. They are rooted in the practical side of man's nature, and their validity depends on the inner satisfaction which their respective objects afford.

In the examples given the value predicated is, in the first case, a natural value, in the second an aesthetic, and in the third an intellectual. While these values are not without significance for religion, they are comparatively unimportant as compared with a fourth class, namely moral values. Every moral judgment is a judgment of value. To pronounce an act or a disposition or an end good or bad is to relate it to the feeling, willing self as possessing for it a worth or an unworth. One can say that the main concern of religion is with moral worths: "Seek ye first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness." As we have already seen, religion's deepest impulse is to find life's great sanctities or worths at the glowing centre of things.

But what assurance have we that they occupy that central position and constitute reality's ultimate meaning? How can we bridge the gulf between value for the human race and value for the universe? Must we wait till the philosopher with his speculative system provides us with a logical demonstration? History, were there nothing else, repudiates with sufficient emphasis that fantastic view. Where religion developed in its purest form and to its loftiest

height, in the prophetic movement, namely, that culminated in Jesus, philosophy was conspicuous by its absence. And religion on the whole owes little enough to philosophy's speculative ministrations.

The truth is that religious faith has a certainty of its own, radically different in kind from logical certainty and able to stand alone. As we have shown, it moves in the region of worths, more particularly of moral worths. And in establishing its worths on the throne of the universe, it proceeds on this assumption that the highest in rank must be the ultimate in being. Bound up with all our worth-affirmations we find this ontological affirmation, made instinctively and almost unconsciously. And the assurance with which we make it is measured by our feeling for the significance and glory of the particular worths as elements in our human life.

The highest in rank must be the ultimate in being—why, you will ask, this necessity? The answer is that it is a moral necessity and morally conditioned. A universe in which it did not hold would not be logically absurd, but it would be morally intolerable. As Socrates long ago declared, if the gods do not prefer the just man to the unjust it were better to die than to live.

It goes without saying that the worths about which faith makes its affirmations are no products of human phantasy, but are historically given. We meet them as facts in the world in which we move, as indubitable parts of reality. A moral order in human life is a fact, and a moral end cherished in the breast of earth's noblest sons and inspiring their highest efforts. Justice and mercy are facts. The purity, the love and the sacrifice of Jesus are facts. Such facts we gather up under the term Revelation. They form the material with which faith deals, the objective reality by which faith is evoked. Faith affirms their absolute worth and their

ontological significance. On the ground of their worth it establishes them on the world's throne.

This we take to be a correct analysis of the cognitive process as it proceeds in the minds of religious people, whether they be great prophets or humble believers. It may serve to confirm our analysis, if we show how it accounts for certain characters that have always been recognised as attaching to religious or faith knowledge.

Among the outstanding features of religious apprehension is the fact that it is morally conditioned. "The secret of the Lord is with them that fear Him." If religious apprehension was a function of the logical reason, if man was religious simply in virtue of his rationality, such a fact would be utterly unintelligible. It is no longer unintelligible but entirely luminous when we understand that our religious faith depends upon what approves itself to us as the highest meaning of our human life, depends upon the values we rank as the highest. Only he who feels the Kingdom of God with its righteousness and its love to be august and supreme will have the impulse to find in them the ultimate meaning of existence.

Again, the value-judgment theory explains what we may call the immediacy of our religious judgments. These judgments are not the result of a careful weighing of evidence and balancing of probabilities. God's existence is not for religion a hypothesis to be tested in the approved scientific fashion. We are borne forward to the great affirmation by the inner rush and tide of our feelings. How this should be becomes clear if our affirmation sums up our attitude toward the sanctities of our human life.

Finally we can say that the value-judgment theory explains the peculiar character that belongs to faith certainty as distinguished from logical certainty. Not seldom the two have been identified, or distinguished only by the

fact that in the former case our affirmations are based on evidence that falls short of being demonstrative. It was this conception of faith that was in Huxley's mind when he condemned faith as immoral, on the ground that it signifies a readiness to assent to a proposition on insufficient evidence. The truth is that with the weighing of evidence faith has little or nothing to do. Faith-certainty is not a logical but a moral certainty, representing the inner momentum of the soul's affirmation of the good and the true. Frequently our religious affirmations are flung in the very face of what seem the hard facts of existence. "Though the fig tree shall not blossom, neither shall fruit be on the vines; the labour of the olive shall fail and the fields shall yield no meat; yet will I rejoice in the Lord, I will joy in the God of my salvation" (Hab. iii. 17). But though our faith-affirmations are not logically demonstrated propositions, it does not follow that we hold them with a less degree of assurance than we hold the latter. It is precisely into such affirmations that we throw the whole force and passion of our being. What is true is that always there attaches to them the character of a venture. We cannot prove the eternal and cosmic significance of life's supreme values, but we stake our life upon the fact, face life and face death on the strength of it.

We may take it then that the knowledge of God on which religion hangs comes to us through another channel than that of the theoretical reason, and that consequently religion is not at all dependent on the constructions of any philosophy. There are, however, two other suppositions as to the bearing of philosophy on religion that remain to be considered.

Granting, it may be said, that the analysis given of the process of faith knowing is a correct one, may it not be possible to go behind these worth-judgments with their attached ontological assumption, and show them and everything else

to be logical developments of a single principle immediately certain to us? Attempts at such a speculative construction are, as a matter of fact, in the field. Idealism essays the task of explaining subject and object, God and the world, morality and religion—everything in short in heaven above and on the earth beneath—from the principle of self-consciousness and its given contents. To subject this system to detailed examination would take us beyond our limits. Suffice it to say that it involves the retranslation of every magnitude of our experience into a form in which their distinctive features are no longer discoverable. Objects are stripped of their objectivity, and the subject is turned into a mere unifying principle. The causal relation disappears from nature, its place being taken by a logical relation. History becomes an illusion, for the universe is eternally complete. The moral impulse and the moral end are interpreted in terms of logic. Logic becomes the mainspring of the very Deity and we get a God whose only accomplishment is to turn dialectical somersaults. The prophecy of Edward Caird that such a philosophy will in time supersede faith—which he regards as only a kind of blind logic—as the ground of our religious convictions, seems to me to be of all prophecies the most preposterous.

But the claim for philosophy, that it can provide a bulwark for religion, may be put in a more moderate way and without any monistic presupposition. Our religious convictions form but one branch of the tree of knowledge, and no one will deny that all truth is interrelated. The task of building all our knowledge, from whatever source derived, into a single system, of exhibiting the universe in all its aspects and workings as an organic whole, is a legitimate one, and one that the human mind will probably never cease attempting. May not philosophy perform a real service for religion by showing that the truths on which religion hangs

are not inconsistent with the truths say of science, that in the unity of the whole every aspect of existence has its place and right ?

To such a view much must be conceded. Unquestionably religious faith is often menaced or even undermined by conceptions of the world which either resolve its ideas into illusions or allow them nothing more than a subjective validity. For many, doubtless, it is enough to fall back on faith's native certainty. But not for all. Assailants must be met on their own ground, and bad metaphysic refuted by better. Not a few have owed their deliverance from the nightmare of materialism to the demonstration that the material world of our experience is relative to a knowing mind. And perhaps faith would gain in security were we in possession of a philosophy which allowed their full value to the great Christian worths and articulated them in a universal scheme.

Does such a philosophy lie within the compass of our human powers ? As we have already pointed out, almost every philosophy has incorporated in its structure elements derived from religion. But of no existing system can it be said that faith and reason alike find themselves at home in it. Of a Christian philosophy we have hardly more than fragments. And despite the Hegelian confidence in the unlimited resources of reason, one may be permitted to doubt whether the structure of the universe will ever be made as clear to the human mind as the mechanism of our grandfather's clock.

And there is another point in this connexion that must not be overlooked. In striving after unity and system, philosophy almost inevitably does violence to the facts, cutting and clipping them that they may fit into their appointed place. Nowhere is this more evident than in the doctrine of God. The philosopher may be concerned to

conserve the moral being of God, but he is also concerned to exhibit God as the ultimate unity in which subject and object, mind and matter, find their ground and explanation. How extremely difficult it is to satisfy one interest without sacrificing the other history sufficiently shows. Of no Absolute ever constructed can we say that it is adequate to the needs of religion. Between the world of Idealistic Philosophy, with its eternal dialectic of ideas, and the mechanical world of Naturalism there is from the religious standpoint little to choose. The one is almost as bleak and inhospitable a place for the human soul as the other. With this peril to religion in view, one can understand how Ritschl should have demanded the complete extrusion of metaphysics from theology and limited theology to the task of systematising the simple affirmations of faith. Beyond question it is by these simple affirmations that religion lives; and so far as one can forecast the future, one may hazard the assertion, that to the end of the chapter the Christian man will walk by faith and not by sight.

W. Morgan.

NOTES ON THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

X. Events in Galilee.

(1) It is probable that a transposition has taken place in the Gospel; and that chapter vi. should precede chapter v. for the following reasons:—The fifty-fourth verse of chapter iv. suggests that Jesus had left Judæa to exercise His ministry for a time at least in Galilee; but the first verse of chapter v., without giving an adequate reason, takes Him away again to Judæa. In iv. 46 He is in Cana in Galilee, and is appealed to by a nobleman from Capernaum. In vi. 1 He is represented as going over the sea of Galilee; a more appropriate description if He was already on the

one side of the sea, than if He was in Jerusalem where v. 47 leaves Him. The first verse of chapter vii. also follows more appropriately after the account of the visit to Jerusalem in chapter v., and the reference there in verses 16 and 18 to the extreme hostility of the Jews. We should probably also restore, as Dr. Moffatt has done in his *New Translation of the New Testament*, the passage vii. 15–24 to its original position in the Gospel after v. 47, as the reference throughout is to the cure on the Sabbath. The order of events, then, would be that Jesus, after the miracle at Cana (iv. 46–54) for a time continued His ministry in Galilee (chap. vi.) ; that after the crisis there He went alone to Jerusalem, probably at the Pentecost (v. 1), following the Passover mentioned in vi. 4 ; that He was compelled by Jewish hostility (v. 1–47 and vii. 15–24) to return to Galilee (vii. 1), but visited Jerusalem again at the feast of Tabernacles (ver. 10). A confirmation of this order of events is suggested by the indefinite reference in v. 1 to " a feast of the Jews," or as "many ancient authorities read, *the feast*" (R.V. marg.). If in the original Pentecost was mentioned, and chaps. v. and vi. were transposed, the Passover would be mentioned between Pentecost and the Feast of Tabernacles, and the indefinite reference might be an attempt to get out of a chronological difficulty. The evangelist was too familiar himself with Jewish affairs not to be able to name this feast.

(2) Fixing our attention now on chapter vi. we are compelled to ask why the evangelist, contrary to his usual custom, covers the same ground as the synoptic records ? (*a*) As will be shown in the next section, it is not likely that the evangelist was himself present at the events recorded in this chapter ; but the narrative came to him at second-hand. While, as was assumed in the previous article, it is probable that he was with Jesus in Galilee till the Gali-

læan disciples were called (according to the synoptic account), it is not necessary to assume this even, and this account (iv. 43–54) too may have come to him at second hand. As ii. 1 suggests, Mary the mother of Jesus, who at the Cross was entrusted to the beloved disciple's care, had some connexion with Cana ; and she may have been his informant about the second sign, as it is to be noted no mention is made of any disciples as having accompanied Jesus. His informants, regarding the events in chapter vi. are not far to seek. Philip and Andrew, who play a part in the story, belonged to the circle of early companions of Jesus (i. 40–44) ; and Andrew was the evangelist's comrade in first following Jesus.

(*b*) But why did the evangelist give this second-hand narrative about Galilee, when he otherwise confines himself to Judæa ? Several reasons can be suggested. (i) Verses fourteen and fifteen are peculiar to the Fourth Gospel ; but it is not at all improbable that the popular enthusiasm was by the miracle raised to danger point ; and that some attempt was made to get Jesus to head a popular movement of revolt. There appears a confirmation of the situation presented in the Fourth Gospel in the statement of Matthew xiv. 22 (Mark vi. 45), that " straightway He constrained His disciples to enter into the boat, and to go before Him unto the other side, till He should send the multitudes away." On the word ἠνάγκασεν Bruce comments : " A strong word needing an explanation not here given, supplied in John vi. 15. Of course there was no physical compulsion, but there must have been urgency on Christ's part, and unwillingness on the part of the disciples " (*The Expositor's Greek Testament*, vol. i., p. 209). If the disciples, sharing the popular enthusiasm, also desired the people's purpose, their disappointment and irritation even may account for their panic in the storm ; and, as Jesus worked no miracle

for mere display, His walking on the water may be regarded as an appeal for their renewed confidence, an appeal which, at the moment at least, seems to have been vain. "Their heart was hardened" (Mark vi. 52). As the keynote of the Gospel of John is struck in i. 11, it is entirely congruous with his purpose that he should record the first step in the rejection of Jesus even in Galilee, where at first He had received a welcome such as Judæa had failed to give. The intention may also be to contrast the enthusiasm of Galilee, however mistaken in its aims, with the hostility of Judæa. (ii) For the second reason we must combine a number of details in the narrative. In verse two the evangelist speaks of *a great multitude*, in verse fourteen of *the people*; in verse twenty-two *the multitude* is again mentioned; but in verses forty-one and fifty-two the *Jews* appear on the scene. It is usually taken for granted that the same persons are referred to, and that the narrative is continuous; but verse twenty-four indicates that the multitude was addressed on the sea-shore, and verse fifty-nine that the controversy with the Jews took place in the synagogue in Capernaum; and any interval may be assumed. What happened meanwhile may be gathered from Mark vii. 1. "And there are gathered together unto Him the Pharisees, and certain of the scribes, which had come from Jerusalem." The opponents described as Jews, we may infer, were not Galilæans but Judæans. The evangelist's interest in the controversy of Jesus with the Jews in Jerusalem led him in his narrative to follow the enemies of the Master into Galilee, in order to show that they, too, were responsible, in some measure at least, for the loss of popularity even in Galilee. If we can thus regard the two references to Jews in John vi., and the one reference in Mark vii. 3 as not to Galilæans, but to Judæans, then we are warranted in affirming that the term Jews is not applied

to Galilæans anywhere in the Gospels, but is always used either of Judæans in contrast with Galilæans, or of the Jewish nation as a whole. The writer does not profess an adequate knowledge of the contemporary Jewish literature to affirm whether this is in accord with a more general practice, or may be regarded as a peculiarity of the Gospels. The problem of the contrast between the subjects and manner of controversy between Jesus and His opponents as recorded in the synoptics and the Fourth Gospel may not be solved ; but its difficulty is somewhat mitigated if in John vi. Jesus is confronting in Galilee His Judæan opponents. Otherwise we cannot appeal to the difference of place, Galilee in the one case, Judæa in the other, for an explanation of the contrast between the synoptics and the Fourth Gospel. How far the report of the conversations in this chapter with even the Galilæans are tinged with the dominant hues of the Judæan controversy we must afterwards consider. Meanwhile these two reasons for the evangelist's turning from the Judæan to the Galilæan ministry may be offered for the sympathetic consideration of scholars.

(3) We must now try to establish the conclusion that the narrative in this chapter is second-hand, derived possibly from Andrew or Philip. (i) The story in Mark vi. 30–44 offers an altogether probable explanation of the occasion for the miracle. Jesus, absorbed in His teaching, moved thereto by His compassion, needs to be reminded by His disciples that the people have been all day without food, and that it will be desirable to dismiss them before nightfall. The record in John bears far less the marks of historical probability, and shows clearly the evangelist's pragmatism. Is it probable that as soon as Jesus saw the multitude coming to Him, He began to be concerned about how they should be fed (verse 5) ? Is not this situation more

artificial and less natural than that presented in Mark? Again, verse six is written from the standpoint of the evangelist's Christology, and accords with other passages in emphasising the supernaturalness of Jesus' knowledge beyond what seem the necessary limitations of a real incarnation. That after the disciples had brought the perilous position before Jesus He addressed Himself to Philip with such a question is not improbable, nor that Andrew offered the information about the five barley loaves and two fishes; especially if one of them was the evangelist's informant, or both were; but the Fourth Evangelist gives the information, however, obtained in a doctrinal rather than a historical setting. The comparison of the synoptic and the Johannine records need not be carried into further detail as regards *vv.* 1–21. (ii) It is not at all improbable that the multitude did follow Jesus to the other side of the lake, and that a conversation bearing on the miracle did take place, although it is strange that the synoptics, Mark and Matthew, have no record of it. Luke does not come into consideration here, for he passes at once from the feeding of the four thousand to the Confession at Cæsarea Philippi (ix. 17–18). Does not the summary of the ministry in Gennesaret (Mark vi. 53–56) suggest that possibly, in their disappointment, some of the disciples, at least for a time, withdrew from their Master, and were not with Him when the event John records took place? It is difficult to suppose, however, that the Fourth Evangelist has given us a verbatim report of what Jesus did say. He had the report second-hand; the language and thought, distinctive of his Gospel, and not of the synoptic account of the teaching of Jesus appear; the conversation at the seashore, and the controversy in the synagogue are combined, and it is too easy a solution of the last difficulty to suppose that the conversation ends with verse 40, and

the controversy begins at verse 41. "The unexpected ἐν συναγωγῇ of vi. 59 coming after vi. 25, and vi. 30 after vi. 14, suggest a conflation of two traditions." (Moffatt's *Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament*, p. 554.) "Chastand," according to Moffatt, "distinguishes a speech in the synagogue (vi. 28–30, 36–40, 43–46) from one by the sea side" (vi. 26–27, 31–35, 41–42, 47–58). We may now examine this suggestion more closely as the basis of our analysis.

(4) Verses 26 and 27 were very probably spoken at the lake shore, as they are quite appropriate to the occasion. Verses 28 and 29 also seem suitable; but they lead on to the demand for a sign, and is it likely that the multitude who had just been fed, and who had been roused to enthusiasm by the miracle, would at once have made such a request? We might refer *vv.* 28–30 with Chastand to the subsequent controversy in the synagogue. Or for an alternative explanation we might recall Mark viii. 11, where a similar demand is recorded after the feeding of the four thousand. If the narrative in Mark viii. 1–10 is a variant tradition of vi. 30–44, then possibly the evangelist, having some knowledge of the Galilæan ministry only at second-hand, may have introduced this incident at what seemed by association of ideas the proper place.

Recognising that reminiscence may have been coloured by reflection, *vv.* 31–35 may continue the conversation at the sea-shore, as Jesus, after feeding the multitude, may have spoken of Himself under the figure of bread. But verses 36–40 seem to contain teaching far too advanced for the multitude at the sea-shore. If Jesus in Jerusalem, as there was no danger of a mistaken Messianic revolt, exercised less reserve with His opponents than He did with the excitable Galilæan multitude, and pressed His personal claims more plainly where there was most resistance; and

if, as has been suggested, He had been followed into Galilee by some of these Judæan opponents, it is not inconceivable that in the controversy in the synagogue He did in substance at least assert what the evangelist reports. So plain a reference to His power in raising from the dead at the last day (verse 40) must, however, seem extremely improbable, and appears to go beyond the claim which, from His other teaching, we conclude He ever made for Himself. The Christology of the evangelist seems, here at least, to affect his report.

Chastand ascribes *vv.* 41 and 42 to the multitude at the seaside. But this is unlikely for three reasons. *Firstly*, does the evangelist not intend to make a distinction between the Galilæan multitude and the Jews? This has already been shown. The Judæan opponents in the synagogue, having heard of the claim Jesus had made before the multitude, would make it a ground of controversy on the first convenient occasion. *Secondly*, would the multitude, after having been fed, murmur at such a claim? *Lastly*, does not verse forty-two recall at once Mark vi. 3; and was not the synagogue in Nazareth a much more likely place for such an objection to be made than the synagogue in Capernaum even? Here, again, there seems to be a displaced second-hand report. Verses 43–46 may belong to the controversy in the synagogue, and what has been said above in reference to *vv.* 36–40 applies here also.

In verses 47 to 51 we probably return to the sea-shore as the thought is continuous with verse 35; but the last clause of verse 51 makes us pause. At this time would Jesus refer to His giving His flesh for the life of the world? Is it likely that He would make even an obscure allusion to His death, when dealing with the multitude, before He had made any announcement of His coming passion to His own disciples? As has already been noted, the evangelist,

looking back after a lapse of so many years, overlooked altogether the gradual development in the teaching of Jesus corresponding to the capacity of His disciples to receive it. The allusion to the flesh is developed in *vv.* 52–57, but the thought of *vv.* 32–35 is resumed in verse 58. Chastand assigns verses 47 to 58 to the conversation at the seashore; but here we cannot follow him. We may admit as possible that *vv.* 47–51 except the last clause ("yea, and the bread which I will give is My flesh, for the life of the world"), and verse 58 were spoken to the multitude, although the difference between both the matter and the manner here and the synoptic discourses is a very serious difficulty, unless we frankly admit that report has been modified to a considerable extent by meditation upon it. The last clause of *v.* 51 and *vv.* 52–57 seem quite out of place in Galilee at this stage of Jesus' ministry. Possibly in the Upper Room Jesus may to some, if not to all His disciples, have expanded the thought implied in the words of institution of the Supper, or we may here have the evangelist's own reflections gathering around his reminiscences of that utterance. The association of ideas may have attracted either reminiscences or reflections to the present context.

(5) The claim of Jesus before the multitude to be the bread from Heaven (*vv.* 31–35), made a subject of controversy subsequently in the synagogue with the Jews (*v.* 41), may have been the hard saying which helped to turn the tide of popularity, and need not refer to the immediately preceding passage. Some crisis there was in Galilee, of which *vv.* 60–65 give an account. But is Jesus likely to have spoken to disciples even of ascending to heaven (*v.* 62) at this stage of His ministry? The use of the term Son of Man inclines the judgment to the conclusion that this is a genuine logion (even as iii. 13–15) which has drifted

from its proper moorings in much later teaching of Jesus to an inner circle of disciples. Verse 63 appears at least in verbal contradiction to the thought developed in *vv.* 52–57, and the relevance of the saying to the situation described is not apparent. In verse 64 the evangelist's comment again betrays his Christology in its constant emphasis on the supernaturalness of Jesus' knowledge. If the situation here referred to is previous to the scene at Cæsarea Philippi, as will next be shewn to be probable, it is not likely that any thought of betrayal had yet entered into the mind of Judas; or that Jesus, whose foresight rested on insight, would as yet have any suspicion of Judas' loyalty, although He may have detected evidence of his discontent. If it was the announcement of the passion (Mark viii. 31) which decided Judas to betray, Jesus' insight may soon have discovered this change of attitude, and His discovery may account for the probable reference to betrayal (*παραδίδοται*) in the second announcement (Mark ix. 31). Not from some timeless *beginning*, as the evangelist may mean, but from the first signs of treachery in Judas, Jesus, by His insight, may have known "who it was that should betray Him." If such a sifting of disciples was taking place, verse 65 contains a thought appropriate to the occasion, and it has a partial, if not complete resemblance to Matthew xi. 25–27. An assertion of such entire dependence on God in His work is entirely congruous with the attitude of Jesus as presented in the synoptics.

(6) The last paragraph in this chapter (*vv.* 66–71) seems to the writer to be a Johannine version of the scene at Cæsarea Philippi. Having his report of that scene at second-hand, the evangelist would have no vivid personal reminiscence of it, and so it would be easy for him, after the lapse of years, to misunderstand its import. As he ascribes to the first disciples at their first contact with Jesus an already

advanced confession of faith (i. 41, 45, 49), he could not think of the Galilæan disciples as for the first time confessing Jesus' Messiahship. For him they had already come so far, that such a crisis could not involve advance to a fuller confession, but only withdrawal from a position already gained. Verses 67, 68, 69 are the Johannine equivalents of Mark viii. 29. But verses 70 to 71, if containing a genuine saying of Jesus, belong to a much later occasion than this. "Thou hast the words of eternal life" is a characteristically Johannine phrase, and sounds strange on the lips of Peter, as "Thou art the Christ" does not.

(7) This minute analysis of the contents of this chapter has brought to clearer light several characteristics of the Gospel, which may in closing be noted. The passage from reminiscence to reflection, and the colouring of the language in which even the reminiscence is expressed by the reflection has appeared from time to time. The disregard of any development in the teaching of Jesus, so that sayings which might be appropriate at a later stage are placed in an improbable context, has also been noted. A tendency to be guided by the association of ideas rather than the chronological sequence has also been illustrated. The most important conclusion, which the writer had reached by a general study of the chapter, has been amply confirmed by the minute scrutiny which has been here pursued. It is that the evangelist was not an eye-witness of the Galilæan ministry, of which he here offers a summary in which a series of events all significant for the great interest of the Gospel, the reception only by the few, and the rejection by the many of Jesus, is, as it were, run together with no attention to intervals of time, so as to allow for a historical development. It is evident that he was dependent on another or others for the report, and that, consequently, there is here absent the vivid reminiscence which, in other

parts, so impresses the reader with the historical character of so much of the Gospel, in spite of its doctrinal purpose. The difference between the synoptics and the Fourth Gospel is the most serious problem it presents ; and here the difficulty must be felt to be most acute, as the ground here is common. Jesus may have spoken differently to learned opponents in Judæa than to the unlearned multitude in Galilee, and the Johannine method may have been just as appropriate in the one case as we feel the synoptic to be in the other. But in this chapter the evangelist transfers to Galilee what is intelligible and credible only in Judæa. The difficulty is partly relieved by the suggestions already made, that in parts of the record Jesus is dealing with Judæan opponents who had followed Him into Galilee, and that sayings of another occasion and a later date have been attracted by the association of ideas into the present context ; but it can be removed only by the candid admission that here the evangelist is dealing with events which he knew imperfectly, and the import of which he did not understand, as the conditions in Judæa were so different from those in Galilee. Does not this confirm the contention that the evangelist was not John the son of Zebedee, but a Judæan disciple ?

Alfred E. Garvie.

NOT PEACE, BUT A SWORD.

The following observations are intended to suggest reasons for believing that a Saying of Jesus, which grates on the modern ear as a specially "hard" one, conveys in reality a message of strength to all whose hearts fail them "for expectation of the things which are coming on the world." The Saying is that recorded in Matthew x. 34, "Think not that I came to send peace on the earth: I came not to send peace, but a sword."

The personal characteristic of our Lord's human nature that has most impressed the imagination of mankind is His gentleness. His gracious invitation, "Come unto me" —reinforced by the assurance "for I am meek and lowly in heart"—has always appealed to those "that labour and are heavy laden" as having in it a ring of sincerity; few, even of those that reject the Speaker's call, deny the truth of His claim.

When St. Paul would repress the self-assertion of the Corinthians, he entreats them "by the meekness and gentleness of Christ," a sure proof that the Gospel story current then reflected the same character of Jesus as that current now. More than this, the life and teaching of Jesus has revolutionised the ethical standard of the most advanced nations. What had been thought a slavish vice—long-suffering, forbearance, meekness—is, according to St. Paul, the one and only means of advance towards the perfection of the human family designed by God; and the power of gentleness is recognised by the most honoured of the world's ethical teachers. This point need not be dwelt on further; enough has been said to shew that there is a contrast which demands explanation, or which is at least worth consideration, between the manner in which Jesus, in His ministry

on earth, dealt with men personally, and the tone of this Saying.

The solution of the problem raised by this utterance will be found, I believe, in a recognition of the necessary difference which is reasonably to be expected between the manifestation of the Christ in His life as a Man amongst men, and the manifestation of the Christ as a force in the life of the world, a force which we commonly call Christianity, or Christian principles, but which is concretely the Church, the Body of Christ, through which the Person of Christ influences the world, the medium chosen by Him for His self-expression.

No examination of the Saying in *Matthew* can be considered complete or satisfactory that does not take account of the form given to it in *Luke ;* the saying belongs to the very ancient Gospel source used independently by Matthew and Luke, a tradition of primordial antiquity.

In *Luke* we read: " I came to cast fire upon the earth ; and what will I, if it is already kindled ? [*or*, how I wish that it were already kindled !]. But I have a baptism to be baptized with ; and how am I straitened till it be accomplished ! Think ye that I am come to give peace in the earth ? I tell you, Nay ; but rather division." And then follows, as in *Matthew*, the detailed account of family strife, taken from the Book of Micah.

We shall use, as we are entitled to use, the fuller form of the Saying as given in *Luke* to explain the shorter form as given in *Matthew* ; and, when we compare them, we are at once struck by the indications in *Luke* of the humanity of the speaker, of humanity in both senses of the term : His possession of natural human instincts, and His sympathy, His sharing in the sufferings of which He is the agent. Neither of these indications of humanity is expressed in *Matthew.*

Taking up these points seriatim, we may note in the first

place that there is no cause for wonder if One who perfectly shared our nature also felt, as we feel instinctively, in regard to a horrible and inevitable future experience, a longing to have it over : How I wish that the fire were kindled ! How I wish that My own baptism of agony and blood were accomplished !

Again, we observe that whereas in *Matthew* we hear only of the consequence to the earth of the casting on it the sword of division, in Luke's version we see that the Lord clearly foresaw that the same future hour which would bring sword and fire to the earth would bring to Himself the baptism of the death of the body, that baptism and cup which on another occasion He set before the two disciples who were ambitious of high place in His kingdom.

We have here no demagogue firebrand, no agitator for anarchy blinded by the intoxication of power to the misery and ruin he has been permitted to effect ; but we thankfully learn how the true Prophet, with kind wisdom and wise kindness, dispels His disciples' delusive hopes of peace, and declares His own share in the educative sufferings of men, His brethren.

Furthermore, we learn from *Luke* that the casting of fire upon the earth, the sending of a sword or division into human society, was not an action of the earthly minstry of Jesus ; it was to be coincident in time with that baptism of death which was to set Him free for a larger and wider exercise of power than was possible to " the prophet, Jesus, from Nazareth of Galilee " : " How am I straitened," He says, " till My baptism be accomplished ! " How I am held, hemmed in, by the temporary limitations of the first phase of the Incarnation !

This last consideration is in harmony with the solution which I suggested at the outset, viz., that the Saying is relative not to the earthly ministry of Jesus, but to His sub-

sequent work in human society, a work in present operation, a work continuous from the day of Pentecost until that day when "the kingdom of the world shall have become the kingdom of our Lord and of His Christ."

This is in fact one of the sayings of Jesus which have no meaning if He were a prophet and nothing more. The words are spoken from the standpoint of Him who said, "I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world"; of Him who said, "where two or three are gathered together in My name, there am I in the midst of them." Here the Christ of the Church makes an announcement about the manner of His working in the world until the end of time.

But some one will say, Is not the promotion of peace the special function of the Christ? Is not peace and tranquillity in the world of nature and in human society the characteristic of the Messianic age on which the prophets most lovingly dwell? Is not the Messiah styled the Prince of Peace? Did not the angelic host in their song connect His nativity with "peace on earth"? Is it not then somewhat of a shock and a disappointment to hear Him say, "Think not that I came to send peace on the earth: I came not to send peace, but a sword"?

This line of thought is natural enough; but as an argument against our acceptance of this hard saying it is only plausible because of common misconceptions as to the nature of peace.

Peace is relative to life, not to death. "They make a desert and they call it peace," was the bitter sarcasm of the German chieftain on the civilising operations of the Roman Government. Stagnation is not peace. The brook that runs chattering through a daisied meadow is more suggestive of peace than is the scum-covered pool which no ripple stirs. The silence of death is not peace. Rather we feel peace in the hum of orderly life, in the harmonious work-

ing of forces, the conflict of which is a conceivable possibility. And this suggests the bracing thought that struggle and conflict of some sort are necessary conditions of peace, just as the activities of a wakeful day are the normal preconditions of a night of health-giving sleep.

So that our Lord's words in this Saying are to be taken as a caution against indulgence in that shallow, weak, optimism which confidently expects as a right the immediate enjoyment of agreeable experiences; which resents as intolerable the doctrine of the Cross. The sword ever precedes true peace. Peace is relative to life; and life means progress and advance; and progress involves the overcoming of opposition, passive or active, conscious or unconscious.

Now we Christians believe that the coming of Christ was the introduction into the world of a force, a new regenerative force, "the power of God unto salvation," as St. Paul calls it. If we were compelled to give a brief definition of the Gospel, we might say that it is the at-one-ment of all things; that is to say, the reconciliation of things which the natural man deems irreconcilable; the consecration of that which is material by that which is spiritual, the making available of that which is spiritual through that which is material; and this involves a new relation of man to God, and of man to man; the Fatherhood of God means the Brotherhood of man.

This—the brotherhood of man—is the Gospel for nations and for races; and the introduction of this force or practical principle into human society, the members of which have the power of choice, marked what St. John calls a κρίσις, a time for each man to make a choice, and to have judgement passed on him according to the choice he has made: "This is the judgement, that the light is come into the world; and," while some "came to the light," those, that is, who had been

" doing the truth," others " loved the darkness rather than the light; for their works were evil."

This κρίσις is part of the experience of every man in every age. We take a wholly inadequate view of the matter if we limit the repelling and attractive power of Jesus—His challenge to men to accept Him or reject Him—to His earthly ministry or to the doctrines taught by Him, as though He were no more than a great, even the greatest, ethical teacher.

Christ is more than a test of character, though He is that; Christ is a force which in its onward and upward movement incorporates, draws in, men and women, multiplies indefinitely thereby their strength and influence, and, I may add with reverence, its own, and breaks down the opposition of all that will not be assimilated to it.

The earthly life of Jesus was the necessary preliminary to the cosmic energies of the Christ; a fundamental fact forgotten or ignored by those who make a factitious contrast between the Jesus of the Gospels and the Christ of the Church. We Christians take our stand upon the apostolic interpretation of the Christ and upon the confirmation of that theory by the experience of history.

It is this that keeps us steady in periods of unrest—unrest in society, uncertainty in religion—such as the period through which we are now passing. As we read history and chronicle our own experiences, we note the application of the force of the Christ ever extending; and His triumphs in the past give us a sure and certain hope of His triumphs in the future. We look back and we see how the old religions—revealed and unrevealed—the Roman Empire, Feudalism, Mediævalism, Slavery, have all in turn gone down before the Christ; and we cannot think that the industrial system of the nineteenth century will exhibit greater powers of endurance than did those giants of old.

We Christians have had in fact no reason to doubt the truth of our Master's assurance, "Lo, I am with you alway"; we believe, in spite of difficulties, that He acts in and on the world through the Church, His Body; our belief in this stimulating truth is not shaken because some men in the Church do their best to thwart the work of Christ by their selfishness and sin, not knowing what they do; our belief is not shaken because men without the Church fail to see Christ in the Church, through the selfishness and sin of Christians, and their own sin and selfishness.

Mine eyes have seen the glory of the coming of the Lord;
He is trampling out the vintage where the grapes of wrath are stored;
He hath loosed the fateful lightning of His terrible swift sword;
His truth is marching on.

He has sounded forth the trumpet that shall never call retreat;
He is sifting out the hearts of men before His judgment-seat;
Oh! be swift, my soul, to answer Him; be jubilant, my feet,—
Our God is marching on.

Meanwhile, as "our hearts muse on the terror" and we strain our eyes for peace, we must have faith and we must have patience, both as individuals and as Society. In particular, we must not lose sight of Christ as controller of the movements of men and director of them to ultimate issues of good.

Let us remember that men may be the hand of God, even though we see plainly by their dishonesty, falsehood, reckless malice, and contempt of God's commandments that they do not believe in God.

God is strong and patient; He uses men, but He does not hurry them into belief in Him. It needed the experience of countless generations to teach our fathers that the commandments of God are the foundations of human society. If a man does not believe in God, it is useless to speak to him of God's commandments. The forgotten lesson will have to be learnt all over again by long and bitter experience.

The proved need for God's law will lead men to God. It may be a long time before God brings us to the haven where we would be; but the sword will not devour for ever, and though the vision of peace tarry, we may confidently wait for it; because it will surely come.

NEWPORT J. D. WHITE.

SOME FRESH NOTES ON THE TEXT OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

IT was the fate of the present writer for some thirteen years to read with students of Theology the Hebrew text of the Old Testament. When one considers that the Hebrew Bible has been read and studied in its minutest details for over two thousand years, it will be obvious that very little that is fresh or new can be said about it. Hence recent expository work done upon it has too often consisted of the wildest extravagances and conjectures which have no basis in the text itself. Whilst, on the one hand, some scholars have attempted to reconstruct a new text for themselves in keeping with their own ideas of grammar and syntax, as well as of the progress of history, others have conceived schemes of metre into which they would force the poetical portions. In all this one thing alone is beyond doubt, and that is, that, if the Hebrew books were written in prose of a literary and classical standard and in verse of a regular number of syllables or accents, then both prose and poetry are lost to us, and to attempt to recover them at this time of day is wasted labour. In the following notes some possible renderings or readings, which seem to have escaped the notice of scholars are offered for the consideration of students, though to those accustomed to modern methods they may seem insignificant and unimportant.

1 Sam. i. 9: "So Hannah rose up after they had eaten

in Shiloh" (אחרי אכלה בשלה). Read אחרי אכל הבשלה, "After eating the boiled flesh." Cf. Wellhausen.

1 Sam. x. 2: "Thou shalt find two men . . . at Zelzah" (בצלצח). Read בצלצלים, "with cymbals," or בצריח, "inside the sepulchral chamber" (of Rachel's tomb).

1 Sam. xi. 7: "Oxen" should in many places be "cows," used for ploughing.

2 Sam. i. 21: "Fields of offerings" (תרומות). Perhaps תדומה or תדומות, "fields of silence," that is, Death.

2 Sam. iii. 12: (Abner sent to David), "saying, Whose is the land? saying *also*, Make thy league with me" (לאמר . . . לאמר לי ארץ). Render, "saying, To whom should I be pleased (למי ארץ or למי ארצה) to say, Make," etc.

2 Sam. xvi. 5: (when David came to Bahurim), "Behold, thence came out a man (הנה משם איש יוצא) of the family of the house of Saul." Render, "Behold, from thence (came) man sprung from the family," etc.

Isa. xxi. 16: "Within a year, according to the years of an hireling." Before "year" (שנה) a numeral above ten seems to have dropped out as in 1 Sam. xiii. 1, "As the years of an hireling" means "exactly."

Isa. xxviii. 16: "I lay in Zion for a foundation a stone": "in Zion" means "consisting of Zion": Zion is the stone.

Isa. xxviii. 20: "The bed is shorter than that a man can stretch himself on it." Cf. Burckhardt, *Egyptian Proverbs*, No. 411, "According to the measure of the clothes stretch the legs."

Isa. xxx. 17: "One thousand *shall flee* at the rebuke of one." Perhaps אלף אחד means "A thousand and one" (shall flee, etc.).

Isa. xxxiv. 8: "For *it is* the day of the Lord's vengeance, *and* the year of recompences for the controversy of Zion" (לריב ציון). Read לרב ציון, "for the Lord of Zion," on

account of the parallelism, רב being later Hebrew or Aramaic for the older אדון.

Jer. xlvi. 9 : The text is probably correct, the construction being the same as in Ps. lxxviii. 9.

Amos. iv. 3 : "And ye shall cast *them* into the palace," והשלכתנה ההרמונה. One of these words is a gloss upon the other. Read either והשלכתן, "And ye shall be cast out," or תרמינה, "ye shall be cast out."

Zech. i. 21 : "These are the horns that have scattered Judah, so that no man (כפי איש לא : cf. Mal. ii. 9) did lift up his head." Instead of כפי איש read כפטיש or כפטיש איש, and render "Judah as with a hammer : one, or he, lifted not up his head."

Zech. xi. 3 : "A voice of the howling of the shepherds, for their glory (אדרתם) is spoiled." Read אדרהם after Jer. xxv. 34 ff., "spoiled are the leaders of the flock."

Zech. xiii. 6 : "What *are* these wounds in thine hands ?" lit. "between thine hands" (בין ידיך), that is, on the front of the body. The expression occurs only here, but is common in Arabic in the sense of standing or appearing *before* a person.

"The house of my friends" (בית מאהבי) might mean "the idol temple" ; מאהב is a metonymy for idol in Hosea ii. 7 ; Ezek. xvi., etc. The wounds are really self-inflicted, mostly on the arms : cf. 1 Kings xviii. 28 and the practices of the modern darwish.

Zech. xiv. 3 : "As when he fought in the day of battle" (ביום קרב). One would expect a proper name, as in "the day of Midian."

Zech. xiv. 19 : The punishment of Egypt is that its horses will perish.

Mal. ii. 16 : "Garment" here means "wife," as in the Korán ii. 183 : "They are a garment unto you, and you are a garment unto them."

Ps. vi. 2: "For I am weak" (אמלל אני). Translate "My strength is withered," אני being for אוני. The parallel phrase is "my bones are vexed."

Ps. ix. 12: "When he maketh inquisition for blood, he remembereth them." "Them" may be "it," אותם referring to דמים.

Ps. ix. 20: "Put them in fear, O Jehovah." Rather, "Make thyself, O Jehovah, a terror to them." שית is so used reflexively (Ps. iii. 6, etc.).

Ps. xxiii. 5: "In the presence of mine enemies." The enemies might be the beasts of prey. Cf. 1 Sam. xvii. 34. The Arab poet Shanfara speaks of the beasts of prey as his friends in contrast to his tribe.

Ps. xlix. 5: "The iniquity of my heels." For "my heels" (עקבי) read "scorpions" (עקרבים). Cf. Ezek. ii. 6. There is an Arabic proverb, *Al-Akārib humu' l-'akārib*, "Relatives are scorpions."

Ps. li. 2: "Wash me" (כבסני) throughly from mine iniquity." כבס is used of washing clothes. The figure is therefore doubly metaphorical.

Ps. liv. 1: Two Hebrew verbs are translated by the English verb "to judge," שפט and דין. The latter is always used of judging peoples or communities, not individuals, at least in the Psalms.

Ps. lxvi. 7: "He ruleth by his power for ever" (עולם). Translate: "He ruleth the world by His power." Cf. Eccl. iii. 11 and Ps. lxxiii. 12, in which עולם perhaps means world, as in later Hebrew.

Ps. lxxviii. 9: see on Jer. xlvi. 9, above.

Ps. cv. 24: "And made them stronger than their enemies" (מצריו). Perhaps there is a play on מצרים, Egypt, or read מצרים.

Ps. cx. 4: "Thou art a priest for ever" (לעולם). לעולם only means "for life," or the meaning is that he is the

founder of a line of priests. The chronicler makes David say (1 Chron. xxviii. 4): "The Lord . . . chose me . . . to be king for ever." Otherwise, Heb. vii. 8, etc.

Ps. cxliv. 12: "That our sons may be as plants grown up (מנדלים) in their youth." The LXX ὡς *νεόφυτα ἡδρυμμένα*, as plants full-grown, points to the reading מגמלים.

Prov. xxx. 31: There are four things that march well, a lion, a greyhound, a he-goat, "and a king against whom there is no rising up" (מלך אלקום עמו). Various explanations of אלקום have been given. It may be the earliest instance of אלהים purposely disguised from motives of superstition. Thus in the Hagiographa published at Naples in 1486–7, יהוה and אלהים are printed יהדה and אלדים. In the Talmud (B. Kam. 106*a* and elsewhere) we have אלקים. The words would then mean "a king on whose side God is."

From the fact that capital letters are not used to mark proper names in the Semitic languages, it is quite possible that there are many of these in the Hebrew Bible which have been read as appellatives. It is especially remarkable that in the Psalms, many of which are so intensely personal, so few proper names occur. Yet this may have been the practice of the times and people. In the book of Job the *dramatis personae* never name one another. The exception that proves the rule is Elihu. Similarly in the Korán only one of Mohammad's disciples is mentioned by name, and that only once. On the other hand, proper names of persons may have been suppressed of set purpose, or mistaken for common nouns.

Perhaps the vocable which is most easily misread and misunderstood is the word אדם. This may stand for Adam (cf. Josh. iii. 16), man, Edom, sometimes for Aram (Syria), and once for אדני (1 Sam. xvii. 32: in xxiv. 9 it is also to be altered: the Greek had אומרים?—"the words of those

who say "). In 2 Sam. xxiv. 14, "Let us not fall into the hand of man," "Edom" would give good sense, being the chief adversary, and there is only one adversary mentioned in ver. 13, where it is necessary to read צרך instead of צריך.

In Ps. lxxvi. 10, "Surely the wrath of man (חמת אדם) shall praise thee, the remainder of wrath (שארית חמת) shalt thou restrain," we might render, omitting the first חמת and changing תחגר into תחגך with the LXX, "For (even) Edom (or Syria ?) shall praise thee, the remnant of Hamath shall keep festival to thee."

Similarly in xciv. 10, 11, "He that teacheth man knowledge . . . the thoughts of man," there would be some point in reading "Edom" for "man," Edom being the seat of wisdom (Obad. 8 ; Jer. xlix. 8). Similarly in cxxiv. 2, we might translate "when Edom rose up against us" ; and in xi. 4, xii. 8 and frequently point is gained by rendering "the sons of Edom" instead of "sons of men."

The curious expression in Gen. xvi. 12 (Job xi. 12) פרא אדם, "wild ass of a man," surely means "wild ass of Edom," especially seeing that it is descriptive of Esau. The last Omeiyad Caliph Merwān was called "The Ass" on account of his endurance. In Isa. xliii. 4, "Therefore will I give men for thee, and peoples for thy life," instead of "men" and "peoples" we expect the names of the nations which are to become the ransom of Israel. So in xxii. 6 Kittel reads "Aram" in the second clause for "men," parallel to Elam and Kir in the first and third. In Ezek. xxxvi. 37, "I will increase them with men like a flock" (כצאן אדם) should probably be "like the flocks of Edom." Cf. Mic. ii. 12, "as the flock of Bozrah." On the other hand in ver. 38 "flocks of men" is probably right.[1]

In Ezek. vii. 14, "They have blown the trumpet" (תקעו

[1] For another example of this ambiguous root cf. Dr. Kennedy's *The Note-Line*, p. 100.

בתקוע) should be "Blow the trumpet in Tekoa," with a play upon the name, as in Jer. vi. 1. The syntax is otherwise anomalous, and the text of the rest of the verse is probably corrupt also.

There is a number of passages, especially in the poetical books, in which the parallelism seems to require a proper name where now there is none, or in which a proper name would seem to be the natural completion of the sentence. Such passages are the following :—

Ps. xviii. 3 :

מהלל אקרא יהיה
ומן איבי אושע:

The A.V. gives the rendering "I will call upon the Lord, *who is worthy* to be praised ; so shall I be saved from mine enemies." מהלל is evidently parallel to מן איבי, and one would expect it to mean "By reason of some one," I call, etc., הלל being all that remains of the enemy's name. In any case the A.V. does not seem to be possible. איבי would be identical with הלל. In the spells and incantations found at Tell Sandahanna the person devoted to destruction is mentioned by name. In ver. 5 of this song, "The sorrows of Hell (חבלי שאול) compassed me about" might equally well and with much point be translated "Saul's bands compassed me about." (For חבל in the sense of a band of men, cf. 1 Sam. x. 5, 10, etc.) One would expect Saul to be named in this poem, but the parallel clause "the snares of death prevented me" shows that here the M.T. is probably right. Again in Ps. xxi. 1 :

יהוה בעזך ישמה מלך
ובישועתך מה יגיל מאד:

"The king shall joy in thy strength, O Lord ; and in thy salvation how greatly shall he rejoice." The last expression is not found elsewhere, and instead of מאד one would expect

the name of the king mentioned in the first member of the parallelism.

It is the fashion of Persian poets to insert their own names in the last quatrain or distich of their *ghazels*. It is believed examples of this are found at the close of the alphabetic Pss. xxv. and xxxiv., where there is an additional verse beginning with the letter *Pē*, and suggesting that the name of the author of these two poems was Pedayah. In other Psalms we find an illegible word in the closing couplets. In xxvii. 13 we have לולא marked with dots above and below. The A.V. supplies a phrase to complete the sense, "*I had fainted* unless I had believed," etc. לולא might well be a corruption of the poet's own name. "I, ——, believed to see," etc. Again the closing verse of Ps. xxx. runs, "To the end that glory (כבוד LXX δόξα μου) may sing praise to thee," etc., where the name of the poet in place of כבוד would make excellent sense. In xxii. 9 we have the untranslatable

גל אל יהוה יפלטהו

(A.V. "He trusted on the Lord that he would deliver him.") With גלאל as the name of the poet, like the Arabic Jelāl, the line would run, "As for Jelāl, the Lord will deliver him." The name, however, would not be Jelāl. Proper names of authors and other persons may be concealed, sometimes through textual corruption, in such places as the following in the Psalms: xxxvi. 1; lii. 1; lv. 3; lvi. title and verses 1 and 2; lviii. 1; lxiii. 9; and elsewhere. That the old Hebrew poets did not object to introduce proper names into their odes is shown by Ps. lx.

It has long been recognised that the name of God is often used in the Semitic languages to denote nothing more than the adjectives "great," "perennial," and the like. Thus in the A.V. we have "Thy righteousness is like the great mountains" (Ps. xxxvi. 6, הררי אל, *lit.* "mountains of

God "), "the godly cedars" (lxxx. 10, ארזי אל, *lit.* "cedars of God"), "an exceeding great city" (Jon. iii. 3, עיר גדולה לאלהים, *lit.* "a great city of God" : cf. Wright's *Arabic Grammar*, ii. 150). But there are many other passages in which this construction is used. Thus in Ps. lxviii. 15, "the hill of God" of the A.V. should be "a great hill" : in Gen. i. 2 "the spirit of God" (רוח אלהים) means "a mighty wind"; and similarly רו יהוה, Isa. xl. 7, and נשמת אלוה, Job iv. 9. The practice, of which a few instances occur in the A.V., might be greatly extended in translating from Hebrew into English. Thus the expression "ark of God" would in English be "the sacred box" or "chest": a "son of God" means a "good person," "sons of God" "good people" (Job i. 6); the "hand" or rod "of God" (Job xix. 21; xxi. 9) means "calamity." A striking example of this difference of idiom is the saying of the centurion at the Cross. In Matt. xxvii. 51, Mark xv. 39 it takes the form "Truly this was a son of God," in Luke xxiii. 47 we have the Occidental equivalent "Certainly this was a righteous man." The expressions are identical, but Matthew was thinking in Aramaic, Luke in Greek.

T. H. Weir.

THE CRITICAL PROBLEMS OF THE EPISTLE TO THE PHILIPPIANS.

It is well known that the later Epistles of St. Paul have certain general differences from the earlier Epistles, and do not call into existence quite the same problems.

As a whole there is now not much serious discussion as to the authenticity of the earlier Epistles; but when we reach the later Epistles we begin to find that there is real reason for asking serious questions as to the authenticity of some, and as to the "integrity"—to use rather a bad word—of others.

It is desirable to consider the general nature of these questions of authenticity and integrity, because we are not here dealing with a problem which we can treat in quite the same manner as if it concerned the letters of a contemporary or of any one of whom we have considerable knowledge. What do we mean when we say we believe that the earlier Epistles of St. Paul are all genuine? We mean, of course, that St. Paul wrote them; but what do we mean by that?

Surely not quite the same sort of belief as we should imply if we said, "Here is a letter written by Napoleon." In the case of Napoleon we should mean that here is a document that is testified to by external evidence, and henceforward will take its place in our general complex of knowledge about Napoleon. We interpret it in the light of our knowledge of the man. But one cannot do that with St.

Paul's Epistles; here we have rather to interpret the man by means of his writings, and these letters are the only writings that we have professing to be written by St. Paul. We can, of course, say "these are the sort of things which would have been written by some one who was a Christian who lived at that time; but in point of fact our ideas of what a Christian would have written are largely based on the Epistles themselves. To follow the circle round with more or less lucidity, is all that we really do. We can in the end only say that these Epistles come to us with a tradition, which is unbroken as far as we can trace it, that they are written by St. Paul; so that by St. Paul we mean primarily "the writer of the Epistles," with the further implication that the author was writing in his own name, and by the clear evidence of the character of the document—not adopting a pseudonym or inventing imaginary circumstances as an artificial background to the composition. The character of the letters shows that they are not pseudepigraphs, and in the end that is all that we mean when we say that the authenticity of the earlier Epistles is indubitable.

That applies with complete force to the main portion of the collection of the Epistles of St. Paul, but not to the whole of it, for the earlier Epistles are only part of the collection. When you take them as a standard and compare with them the other writings in the same collection, you have a different problem.

The question of authenticity is now really a question of comparison between the later and earlier Epistles. The difficulty which arises is clear. It is a difficulty which has nothing to do with criticism in the sense of the discovery of new facts, nor does the theory of "non-Pauline" origin necessarily imply pseudepigraphy. It need only imply that some redactor found material which he—erroneously—regarded as Pauline, and incorporated in the collection of

Pauline epistles, though of course certain theories as to Ephesians and to Pastoral Epistles go further than this. The real difficulty—and it will never disappear—is concerned with our general views on human nature.

You can settle the question of the authenticity of the later Epistles if you can give an answer to four questions:—

(*a*) What are the limits of change in a writer's style in writing letters? (*b*) How far is a man's style likely to change from one letter to another? (*c*) How far are a man's thoughts likely to change from year to year? (*d*) What are the limits of development in the human intellect?

The question of authenticity is quite simple to answer when you can answer those questions. But the fact is that no one can answer them, and I should say that till the end of time there will be room for a certain amount of doubt as to the authenticity of some of the later Epistles.

We now come to the question of integrity; the question, that is to say, whether it is not possible that in some of the Epistles we have got *not* documents written all at once by the same writer, but either a collection of fragments written by the same writer (that is to say by St. Paul) but not written at the same time, or else documents which are in the main written by St. Paul, which also contain paragraphs added by somebody else in order to twist the meaning round to suit his own purpose.

Neither of these possibilities can be excluded because we know that both of them can be paralleled in Christian literature.

Finally, there is one more question which is always important and has been more widely recognised than the other two. That is the question of the "date." I do not mean the actual year in which any given epistle was written, but the relative date.

These remarks are introductory to a discussion of the Epistle to the Philippians. You will find that in the Epistle to the Philippians you have to deal with the question of integrity and with the question of date; the question of authenticity does not come nearly so much into the foreground of the picture as it does in connexion with Colossians and Ephesians or with the Pastorals.

1. *The Question of Integrity.*

Ever since the modern study of the Epistle to Philippians began a difficulty has been found in chapter iii., and it is this which raises the question of integrity. The simplest way to show what the difficulty is, is to write out a piece of the Epistle at the doubtful point. St. Paul says that he is going to send back to the Philippians their friend Epaphroditus, but he says they will be sorry to hear he has been sick. "For indeed he was sick,—nigh unto death: but God had mercy on him, and not on him only, but on me also, lest I should have sorrow upon sorrow. I sent him therefore the more carefully that when ye see him again, ye may rejoice, and that I may be the less sorrowful. Receive him therefore in the Lord, with all gladness; and hold such in reputation. Because for the work of Christ he was nigh unto death, not regarding his life to supply your lack of service toward me.

"Finally, my brethren, rejoice in the Lord, rejoice in the Lord always; again I say rejoice. Let your moderation (τὸ ἐπιεικές) be known unto all men. The Lord is at hand; be anxious for nothing, etc."

Who would see anything wrong with that? No one; unless he knew the text by heart no one would realise that I have left out a chapter and a half.

Let me now copy it again, putting in the beginning of what I have left out.

"I sent him therefore the more carefully that when ye see him again, ye may rejoice, and that I may be the less sorrowful. Receive him therefore in the Lord with all gladness; and hold such in reputation. Because for the work of Christ he was nigh unto death, not regarding his life to supply your lack of service toward me. Finally, my brethren, rejoice in the Lord. To write the same things to you, to me indeed is not grievous, but for you it is safe. Beware of dogs, etc."

Does that fit on? Is it natural to say "rejoice in the Lord always" and then suddenly say "Beware of dogs"? Those questions are the justification of the critics who say there is the possibility of interpolation in the Epistle, or that something of a literary nature has gone wrong. And we must remember that to recognise this is quite another thing to saying that any special theory is entirely satisfactory.

The theory that in some form is always present is that the section that begins "Beware of dogs" is a fragment of another Epistle written by St. Paul to the Philippians at another time. It is not suggested that this is an interpolation by some one else and not by St. Paul, but that it is a fragment of another Epistle written by St. Paul to the Philippians. It is in itself not an improbable theory, seeing that something of the kind almost certainly has happened to 2 Corinthians, but what is against it is that although there is a clear "seam" at the beginning, there is not one at the end. The point at which the beginning of the interpolation—"Beware of dogs"—is reached is clear, but it is not so easy to say where we ought to put the end of it. After the beginning the text seems to run smoothly until it merges in the end of the Epistle, and to refer to the same circumstances as those to which allusion was made at the beginning—the help that was being sent by the

Philippians. If we could draw a line sharply at the end as at the beginning, the theory of interpolation would be nearly certain. As it is, more complicated views have been suggested, and complication in such cases always means uncertainty.

The theory which best gets round the difficulty is that of Hausrath,[1] who suggests that what happened is this :— St. Paul was imprisoned. The Philippians sent help to him and he wrote a letter in which, besides thanking them, he also indulged in some strong remarks about a school of thought with which he did not agree ; warning them against listening to his opponents and referring to them as " dogs " ; part of this is preserved in Philippians iii. 1–end. Then later on he wrote another letter in which he refers once more to their kindness and explains that he was now sending back to them Epaphroditus. There is a short interval of time between the two. The first Epistle (which is the *second* part of our Epistle), was his letter of thanks and warning which was written under the influence of his first hearing of the school of thought which had become prevalent at Philippi. The second Epistle (which is the first part of our Epistle) was written later, when he found it necessary to send Epaphroditus back, also saying that he hopes to send Timothy before long to see how the Church is progressing.

That is a not impossible theory ; and after all we cannot reach more than possibilities when the evidence is insufficient to prove anything. It is, at all events, the best of the theories of its kind. But there is one especially weak point in it. According to this St. Paul does a strange thing—though it is not an impossible one. He has received an important present from the Philippians, and yet does not thank them until the end of his letter. He warns them about other people before thanking them, and this is not natural. Thus

[1] *Paulus*, pp. 486 ff., and *Neutest. Zeitgesch.*, III. p. 398 f.

the partition theory of Hausrath is not quite satisfactory, because it leaves a difficulty on our hands, and a theory is not satisfactory until it covers all the difficulties of the case.

For this reason I should personally incline to the view which is implied in the reconstruction written above. I think that there may be an interpolation beginning with iii. 1 (or iii. 2) and ending with iv. 3. The " seam " at the end is not so clear as at the beginning, but I think that it is not quite invisible. The interpolation I should regard as genuinely Pauline, and I should quote as a parallel 2 Corinthians vi. 14–vii. 1, which certainly seems not only probably to be an interpolation in 2 Corinthians, but possibly to be a fragment of the " Previous letter " of Paul to the Corinthians which preceded 1 Corinthians.

It may, however, be asked whether there is any external evidence to support Hausrath's, or any other partition theory. There is a little ; for Polycarp, when he wrote to the Philippians in the first century A.D., speaks about St. Paul having written to them " in all his Epistles." Now when he says " Epistles," is it only an exaggeration ? Perhaps : but it is possible that Polycarp knew what he was talking about, and if the situation were the other way round and Polycarp's evidence was contrary to the theory of more Epistles than one, we should be told with some emphasis that we have no right to go behind the words of an early authority like Polycarp.

Can we form any reasonable idea as to why we should have two letters of St. Paul's telescoped together as we seem possibly to have in Philippians, and much more probably have in 2 Corinthians ? I think that it can have happened in this way. Go back in imagination to the earliest days of Church history. Why did people value St. Paul's Epistles ? Primarily because they thought that he

gave them good and valuable advice. Now, not every letter which you receive from important people is valuable for the sake of its contents. Therefore you can conclude that Paul wrote some things which in the opinion of his readers were of value and importance, and some things which they regarded as quite ephemeral. But if you go on further, you find that the time very soon came when St. Paul's memory was cherished, when everything he wrote was treasured up because it was Paul's, and quite apart from its contents. Well now, each Church to which Paul had ever written would have a little *dossier* of material, odds and ends from St. Paul, in addition to some more important letters. It would not be long before the churches began to exchange their collections. The Corinthians, Philippians, Romans and Colossians would send each other copies, for of course they would not send the originals. Just at that point, then, you get a reasonable sort of possibility that they would send a document which would contain not only the main letter which Paul had written, but also a copy, more or less continuously written out, of all the little fragments which were extant, and perhaps even some things which had got in by mistake which he had never written at all. This stage, when the Church exchanged documents, lasted only a short time. Very soon the process was completed, they had all exchanged all that they had, and thus you have the collection of the Pauline letters—the *Corpus Paulinum*—which we still possess. We have not got in the New Testament independent copies each going back to the Church to which they were originally sent, but we have got a copy of a collection of letters which emerged from the exchange of smaller collections, and that is a reasonable justification of any theories such as those current in connexion with the Epistles to the Corinthians, or Philippians, or the two recensions of Romans.

2. *The Question of Date and Provenance.*

These questions refer to the point in Paul's career at which Philippians was written. A few years ago I do not think any one would have been inclined to regard them as matters of importance, because we should all have said that if there was anything certain in the Epistles it was that the Epistle to the Philippians was written by Paul when he was in prison in Rome, and it is by no means clear that this is not the most probable view; but in the last few years we have had Deissmann and Albertz both suggesting with considerable force the theory that the Epistle to Philippians was written at Ephesus during an imprisonment which is not recorded in the Acts of the Apostles, but is alluded to in the Epistle to the Corinthians. So that there is now a serious question to discuss.

Let us begin by taking the case for Rome and noticing what are the points in its favour and the points against it. The points in its favour are that Paul certainly was in prison at Rome in some sense, and that he refers to himself in the Epistle to the Philippians as a prisoner. He says that he has become known "to the whole Praetorium"—whatever that means—and he refers to the Christians who belong to the "household of Cæsar." The family of Cæsar here is, of course, not the Imperial family, but the slaves who were attached in some sense to the Imperial household.

Those, then, are the three points in favour of the Roman hypothesis:—

(1) The imprisonment in Rome; (2) The Prætorium; (3) The household of Cæsar.

The points against it are that on the whole the characteristics of the Epistles agree with the Epistles to Corinthians and the Epistles to the Romans rather than with the characteristics of the Epistles to the Colossians, which, if genuine,

was in all probability written either from Rome or, during his previous imprisonment, from Cæsarea.

Moreover, reading the Epistle to Philippians straight through, and then asking yourself when it was written, you would immediately say it was written towards the *end* of his imprisonment, when his trial was coming on at any moment and he was not at all certain how it was going to turn out. It has been described by German critics as being the last words of Paul when in prison. Obviously if this is so, it is awkward that it should agree in style and sentiment with Corinthians and Romans, rather than with Colossians which was written in Rome. Bishop Lightfoot, it is true, felt that difficulty and tried to overcome it by adopting the theory that Philippians was not written towards the end of his imprisonment, and that Colossians must be put further on, and in that way preserved the line of development. Even so the development is rather sudden, for it is only a difference of a few months between Philippians and Colossians, even if we attach some critics have also endeavoured to minimize the difficulty by quoting Philippians ii. 8 and urging that this after all agrees more with Colossians than with the earlier Epistles.

Let us now turn to the proposition that Paul was imprisoned at Ephesus and wrote Philippians then.

The advantages of this theory are that in this case we have Philippians written at the same time, roughly speaking, as the Epistles to which it has the greatest resemblance. It was written at the same place and at the same time as the Epistle to the Corinthians, and we have all the time we need between it and the Epistle to the Colossians. It is even possible to add to that, by pointing out that in Philippians ii. 19 St. Paul is trusting to send Timothy shortly to the Philippians, and that in Corinthians he refers to sending Timothy to Macedonia. In fact, if we had

known that this Epistle was written from Ephesus, this would have been put down as one of the most striking points of undesigned coincidence that we could have.

In going on to discuss the drawbacks of the theory it appears that their statement and discussion is made most plain by an attempt to answer the three following questions :—

(1) Can we show a reason for supposing Paul was imprisoned at Ephesus ? (2) Can we explain a reference to the Prætorium in Ephesus ? (3) Can we explain the Household of Cæsar as existing in Ephesus ?

Imprisonment at Ephesus.—In answer to the first question, Deissmann and Albertz[1] say that Paul must have been imprisoned at Ephesus, because this is implied by 1 Corinthians xv. 32 : " If after the manner of men I have fought with beasts at Ephesus, what advantageth it me? " That is not merely an uncomplimentary allusion to the inhabitants of Ephesus ; for as a matter of fact the fighting with wild beasts was a form of execution which was often carried out. We are, it is true, sometimes told that that is nevertheless impossible here, since it could not have happened to Paul because he was a Roman citizen, and a Roman citizen could not be condemned to fight with beasts, and that in any case Luke would have mentioned it. But Luke reported events which he regarded as suitable for his purpose ; he did not tell everything. He certainly omitted the intermediate visit to Corinth, and possibly he may have omitted some scene in which St. Paul came into conflict with the authorities and went to prison and was in danger of being condemned to the beasts. It is very easy to say that a Roman citizen could not be condemned to fight with beasts. Supposing they said, " We do not believe you are a Roman." How do you know that St. Paul could

[1] *Theol. Studien und Kritiken*, 1910, pp. 551 ff.

prove it? How do you know he was always in a position to do so? Moreover, unless I am quite wrong, the exact meaning of the phrase in Corinthians is not that he did fight with beasts, but that there was a possibility of his doing so. It is obscure; but εἰ with the aorist indicative often implies an unfulfilled condition. But fighting with beasts is in any case not a possibility unless the fighter has first been arrested and is in prison, and if the possibility existed it must imply the imprisonment of Paul.

If you turn to 2 Corinthians you will find that Paul refers to the extreme tribulation which he underwent in Ephesus. He says, among other things that he despaired of life itself. Deissmann and Albertz say that here we have a further allusion to imprisonment at Ephesus. But the difficulty must be admitted to exist whether it can be the same imprisonment referred to in "If I have fought with beasts," seeing that the writing of 1 Corinthians and other events come in between the two references.

The Prætorium.—It was, according to Albertz, Mommsen who, without knowing the connexion of the facts with an imprisonment in Ephesus which had not been yet suggested, first drew attention to the existence of *Prætoriani* in Ephesus as proved by an inscription given in Wood's discoveries at Ephesus. If, therefore, τὸ πραιτώριον be taken to refer to soldiers, thereis no reason for not accepting Ephesus, and Albertz even argues that Ephesus is more probable than Rome because in Rome the whole Prætorian Body would be about 9,000 men, and it is improbable that Paul came into contact with so many, while in Ephesus there would be only a few Prætorians on special duty. If, however, τὸ πραιτώριον be taken as the translation of *Prætorium* in a local sense, Albertz is still ready to argue that this fits Ephesus. There is, he says, no satisfactory proof that Prætorium can mean either the Palace of the Cæsars or the

Castra Prætorianorum by the Porta Viminalis or anything similar. "It would more probably mean an Imperial Villa outside Rome, and would be peculiarly appropriate for the residence of a Governor. . . . The expression points not so much to the city of Rome as to the provinces, in which Governors were stationed. It therefore suits admirably a reference to Ephesus, the residence of a Governor of Asia." Thus whatever interpretation be given to τὸ πραιτώριον —and this is likely always to be disputed—Ephesus cannot be excluded as ruled out by this phrase.

The Household of Cæsar.—Obviously Rome is the most natural place in which to look for slaves attached to the Imperial Household, but here again Albertz shows that epigraphical evidence proves that the phrase would also have a natural meaning in Ephesus. Not only were there individuals belonging to this class, but they were even formed into societies—*collegia*—especially burial societies—and Albertz goes so far as to connect with this fact (I should think a little rashly) the existence in Ephesus of a phyle with the name "Imperial" (σεβαστή). Here, therefore, there is again quite good reason for saying that if an Ephesian imprisonment be granted there is no reason for refusing a hearing to the theory which suggests that Philippians was written from Ephesus, and so putting this Epistle into the same period as Corinthians and Romans, with which it has, on the whole, far more points of contact than with Colossians and Ephesians.

K. Lake.

THE EXAMPLE OF CHRIST IN PRAYER.

PRAYER is the most characteristic action of the spiritual life. The more we know of the spiritual life, the better can we pray. And so it is natural to examine the manner in which Christ prayed, for He was (in the lowest view of His Personality that serious men have accepted) the Supreme Master of the spiritual life. How did He pray? And in what sense can His example be profitable for us who only half understand Him?

Christ taught us to pray, indeed, for He left us the Lord's Prayer as a model; but at least one of its petitions was such as He could not have used for Himself. He had no need to ask to be *forgiven*. How did He pray Himself?

There is a sense in which our prayers cannot and ought not to be expressed as His prayers must have been, for His fellowship with God was unique. He never said "Our Father"; He said "My Father." That filial relationship which is the heritage of all the sons of men meant something peculiar, and not to be explained completely, for Him who was *the* Son of Man. None of us could say with sincerity, "Thinkest thou that I cannot beseech my Father, and He shall even now send me more than twelve legions of angels?"[1]

And yet He was the Son of *Man*. He chose to live within the conditions of human life. The differences between His manner of prayer and ours ought to be pondered with anxiety before we decide that they are wholly due to His Divine Sonship. Our habit, to take only one illustration, is to think of the limitations of the power of prayer, of what we must not expect it to do; His habit, on the contrary, was to assume its unmeasured possibilities. Perhaps we ought to be bolder in our prayers, more largely expectant

[1] Matt. xxvi. 53.

than most of us venture to be. At any rate, the Lord's example here is confirmed by the definiteness of His precept, "Ask and ye shall have."

Or, again, our most sincere and intense prayers are generally called forth by our sense of need, of failure, of weakness, of an incapacity to meet the calls of life, as we should like to meet them. But the consciousness of such weakness was not the motive of the greater prayers of Christ. "Can we not feel that it might be a yet nobler prayer which sprang from the realisation of entrusted power, and from a sense of the responsibility which such power involves?"[1]

Consider this record, the record of the first day of the Lord's public ministry, as told by St. Mark. He called busy men from their fishing, and they left their nets. They could not resist the voice of power, which said, "Follow Me." He went into the synagogue and taught—He, a stranger—and they were astonished at the ring of authority in His voice. He bade the spirit of uncleanness to depart, and it passed away. He healed a sick woman by His touch. He cured the sick and the distracted, so that "all the city was gathered at the door." And, then, in the night after His amazing success—as we should call it—He went out quietly and prayed. That is, surely, the prayer of strength, not of weakness. And there is even more. For in the midst of His prayer one came and said, "All are seeking Thee." But the quiet answer of authority is only this: "Let us go elsewhere." He who is Master of all is the Master of Himself.

It is no isolated episode. We have the same thing after the Feeding of the Five Thousand, the same thing after the Coming of the Greek inquirers—the forerunners of Gentile Christendom—to His presence. Prayer before our great undertakings we understand a little; Christ prayed

[1] *Cambridge Theological Essays*, p. 300.

when success had been reached. The prayer of thanksgiving is indeed the natural expression of the strong. But in the Gospels something more is taught about Christ's thanksgivings. "I thank Thee that thou heardest Me" came before, not after, the deliverance of Lazarus from the tomb. We wait—indeed, we feel that we must wait—until our work has been crowned before we give God thanks. Yet, even the saints of the Old Testament might teach us differently. The chant of the soldiers of Judah before the battle was not a prayer for victory. It was, "Give thanks to the Lord, for His mercy endureth for ever."[1] Even so, the Last Supper before the Cross and the Resurrection was a Eucharist, a giving of thanks.

Who will presume to say that we can reach these heights? But perhaps we ought to remind ourselves of them.

There are other features of the Lord's habit of prayer, which we can set ourselves more hopefully to imitate.

I. It is a very remarkable thing that our Lord was accustomed to observe the Jewish customs of public worship. He was the prophet and the Founder of a new Church, and He knew it. But for all that, He observed the Feasts of the old Church. The worship of the village Synagogue, the worship of the Temple at Jerusalem, He shared, although He knew—as no one else knew—that it was only the shadow of things to come, to be fulfilled in the worship which He was to inaugurate and to bless. His habit of private prayer did not supersede in His own practice the hallowed observances of the ancient Law. "I must needs go up to the Feast." It is difficult to suppose that these visits to the Temple at sacred seasons were solely for the sake of His brethren in the flesh, and that He did not in His own person use the opportunity thus offered of communion with the Father. Just as difficult would it be to suppose that His

[1] 2 Chron. xx. 21.

references to the Old Testament Scriptures were only for the sake of edification, and that they do not rather point to one of the springs from which His spiritual life, as Man, was continually replenished. Nay, we have here an example for our own imitation. It is in the ancient prayers, the hallowed rites of Christendom, that we may best find strength and refreshment for ourselves. No esoteric or electric coterie of religious companions must be permitted to supersede the Church's fellowship in prayer, if we are to follow the example of Him who is our Master.

We are not, indeed, left in doubt as to the familiarity of our Lord with the old prayers of Jewish piety, when we read the story of the Passion. The Lord's Death was a perfect human death, and as with us men the prayers that came to His lips in the last moments were no new prayers. The two personal cries to God which He uttered from the Cross were both of them consecrated by the devotion of many centuries. In the darkest hour of all, the mysterious agony of Redemption is expressed in the old, sad words: "My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me?" And the last words of calm assurance are the words of another Psalm, in which a saint of olden time had consecrated not his death, but his life. "Into Thy hands I commend my spirit." In death, the thoughts and habits of life always express themselves. What a habit of prayer is here revealed! Here, at any rate, we may follow His method, as our example, —His habit of using the hallowed phrases of the saints of the ancient days.

II. More obvious, and therefore, probably, more important, are the indications in the Gospels of the Lord's habit of special prayer before any crisis, that is, before what we should call any new departure in His public ministry. This is specially evident in St. Luke's Gospel. All the Synoptic Gospels tell, as we should expect, of the Prayers at Gethse-

mane; but St. Luke gives other instances. For instance, the selection of the Twelve Apostles was preceded by a night of intercession. "He went out into the mountain to pray, and He continued all night in prayer to God."[1] There is sacred precedent for the ember weeks of prayer before the ordination of Ministers.

Or, again, the great decision that the time had come to tell the Apostles that the end of His public ministry would be the Cross, was preceded by prayer. It was an announcement which must have tried their loyalty to the uttermost; and, before He asked them what they really thought about Him, "He was praying alone."[2]

Or, again, He is about to reassure the choicest members of the little band of His companions by a vision of His majesty. "He took with Him, Peter and James and John, and they went up into the mountain to pray. And as He was praying, the fashion of His countenance was changed."[3] The Transfiguration was preceded by prayer, not now of solitary intercession, but of prayer with His friends.

Every crisis of His ministry was prepared for thus.

III. And, lastly, notice the directness and the restraint —if that is the right word—of Christ's prayers for those who are called to be His disciples. "Simon, Simon . . . I made supplication for thee, that thy faith fail not."[4] Here is the intercession for the individual friend who is in danger from spiritual foes. The prayer is that, however he may fall, his faith may not utterly fail. And it did not fail, as we know.

So, in like fashion, He prayed for all the Apostles, in the great Intercession recorded by St. John alone. "I pray not that Thou shouldest take them from the world, but that

[1] Luke vi. 12. [2] Luke ix. 18. [3] Luke ix. 28.
[4] Luke xxii. 32.

Thou shouldest keep them from the evil one. . . . I pray for them: I pray not for the world, but for them whom Thou hast given Me."[1]

And then the circle widens, as it always does in prayer. "Neither for them only do I pray, but for them also that believe on Me through their word." The prayer for the known and trusted friends enlarges itself into a prayer for *their* friends, for those in whom they are interested, until at last it embraces the whole Christian people of the future, "that they all may be one" . . . even in such an inseparable fellowship as that which unites Him to His Father, "as we are one."[2]

The order of the petitions in this prayer of Christ is, we may be sure, significant. We desire to imitate Him in His prayer for Unity; there can be no doubt that it is His Will that His Church should be One—in visible reality which all the world may see, because of the invisible oneness of life which is the heritage of the Christian people. We cannot doubt it, and so we set ourselves to pray, sometimes—at any rate, we know that we *ought* to pray—for the consummation of the Lord's will in this as in other things. But it is very difficult to do it—very difficult to take into our charity so various a company, or to lift our thoughts to the grandeur of such a hope. And, to say it frankly, our prayers do not seem to advance the reunion of Christendom very effectually. There are many reasons, to be sure, why we must not be in haste; but I desire to suggest this one thing only now. If we are to fashion our prayers for Unity after the model of Christ's prayer for Unity, we must begin at the beginning. First, the prayer for those who are our own dear friends and comrades in the Christian life, for each according to his need, that they may be kept safe in the one Name which is the Name of Christ the Re-

[1] John xvii. 15, 9. [2] *vv.* 21, 22.

deemer.[1] It is not very easy even to get as far as that, for these comrades of ours are men of various minds and temperaments, sometimes very unlike our own, and will take their own line, as God has taught them, if they be true men at all. Their divergences from our ways of thinking affect us more intimately than the wider divergence of others at a greater distance, and we are sometimes inclined to magnify that which is near, very unduly. Nay, we must school ourselves to pray, first, for those of our own Church and household in all its parts, before we venture to lift our eyes to the larger unity that is beyond. And, then, when we have learnt thus to pray for our friends, we shall find it easier to pray for those also that believe in Christ "through their word" (*v.* 20), for that larger company, still more remote from our daily life, whom they influence and inspire. Few of us get as far as that. Yet it was after all this, that the Prayer of Christ was prayed for the Unity of the whole Christian people, "that they *all* may be one." And I suppose that the lesson of this order in the prayer of Christ is that in prayer, as in all other things, we must proceed from the known to the unknown; practise it first where we vividly realise that its practical bearing is to be, and then, when we have learnt to do that, trust ourselves to pray for a consummation of which we very imperfectly understand the issues. We must creep before we can fly. We must learn to pray for our own before we can pray for strangers. Christ prayed first for His friends, then for their disciples, then for all who were to call themselves by His name. That was His method. Perhaps it ought to be ours, in some measure, too.

He may be our example in Prayer—in its largeness of petition, in its thankfulness, in its intensity at the crises of life, in the order of our intercessions. Yet all these we may

[1] *v.* 11.

hope will come right if only we take Him for our Example in the frequency of His prayers. What prompted the disciples at the first to say to Him, "Lord, teach us to pray," was that they saw Him at prayer. And then He taught them the Lord's Prayer.

JOHN OSSORY.

'THANKWORTHY' GOODNESS.

Readers who thoughtfully compare the Matthaean and the Lukan versions of the Sermon on the Mount are inevitably impressed with the difficulty each evangelist seems to experience at the very culmination of the discourse in expressing its principal thought. All recognize that this culmination is reached in the paragraph Matthew v. 43–48 = Luke vi. 27–36, which contrasts the higher righteousness of the Kingdom of God with that of the scribes. The righteousness of the scribes is prescriptive, it aims only at equivalence, tit for tat, meeting the requirement. The righteousness of the heirs of the Kingdom is an imitation of God as beloved children.[1] God does not restrict His kindness to merit. He overcomes evil with good. He is kind even to the unthankful and evil. Such is the new law. It is 'free' and 'royal.' It is 'perfect' (τέλειος), because the limitation of human evil and the 'hardness of men's hearts' no longer limit it. The disciple of Jesus will prove himself a 'son of the Highest' by exhibiting the disposition of his Father. He will give 'hoping for nothing again' (μηδὲν ἀπελπίζων) as God gives to all *outright* (Jas. i. 5 ἁπλῶς, A.V. and R.V. "liberally"), not even reproaching the unworthy. The disciple of Jesus will meet evil with good, and so overcome it as God does. We will serve and bless, not as a matter of equivalence, and to meet obligations, but 'royally,' divinely, as one whose object is not gain but giving, one who truly finds it "more blessed to give than to receive."

There will be no dispute of the fact that this distinction between the limited goodness of human prescription, and

[1] Cf. Eph. iv. 25–v. 2, where St. Paul, contrasting Christian ethics with conduct unsanctified by the Spirit, winds up with the general principle: "So, then, be imitators of God as children beloved, and let your walk (= *halacha*) be in love."

the unlimited goodness of the divine action, a righteousness which "sons and daughters of the Highest" should make their standard, forms the real heart of the Sermon on the Mount in both versions. The method is that of contrast, and involves hyperbole. Allowance must be made for the statement of comparisons which are really relative as if they were absolute. The five antitheses which in Matthew precede the statement of the principle contrast the external requirement which "they of old time" had imposed with Jesus' inward requirement. They give illustrations of the contrast between "the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees" and "the righteousness of God." They lead up to the general principle which we appropriately designate the Law of love. In a general way, then, the sense is clear. Still it is quite apparent also that our two reporters are labouring with certain inadequacies of language to express precisely the thought in view. In all probability its original expression was Aramaic, and Matthew and Luke resort to different Greek terms to convey it. Luke in three successive examples of supposititious 'acts of righteousness' uses the expression: "What kind of 'grace' have ye?" (*ποία ὑμῖν χάρις ἐστίν*; vi. 32, 33, 34; R.V. "What 'thank' have ye?"), and follows it up "But love ye" (after God's way) . . . "and your 'reward' (*μισθός*) shall be great" (v. 35). Matthew for the first example (v. 46) has "What 'reward' (*μισθός*) have ye?" for the second (v. 47) "What do ye over and above?" (*περισσόν*, R.V. "more than others").[1] The conclusion is expressed by Matthew: "So, then, ye shall be 'complete' (*τέλειοι*) as your heavenly Father is complete," by Luke: "Be ye 'merciful' (*οἰκτείρμονες*) as your Father is merciful." Obviously neither Matthew's rendering nor Luke's succeeds in conveying the real point

[1] Cf. 1 Pet. ii. 19 f., of deserved suffering in contrast with undeserved, "What kind of glory is it?" (*ποῖον κλέος*;).

to the ordinary reader. The distinction made between human righteousness and the righteousness of God is not that the one is imperfect and the other "perfect," nor that the one is more "merciful" than the other; but that the one is *absolute* and disinterested, while the other is *relative* and self-seeking. To deserve the name 'children' of God says the Speaker in effect, you must evince a disposition corresponding to such paternity. Your goodness must be absolute and not relative. The scribes delight in the thought that the sons of Israel are children of God. The proof of it is the gift of the Law (Deut. xiv. 1 f. So Akiba, *Pirke Aboth*). To know the Law is to be potentially a son, to keep it is to ensure the inheritance as a heavenly reward. My disciples, too, says Jesus, are to be "sons and daughters of the Highest" but by a higher, a 'perfect,' 'free,' a 'royal' law—moral likeness to their Father.

We have here nothing less than a logical, consistent attempt to transcend Judaistic legalism by substituting for its bibliolatry something akin to the Stoic principle of obedience to Nature as the expression of God, not indeed in Stoic, pantheistic form, but as adapted in the Wisdom writings. The definition of the divine disposition, the appeal to the course of nature in support of it, and the erection of it into an absolute ethical standard are all elements of the 'diatribe,' or current Stoic preaching, and date back to Plato himself. The Father in heaven of the Sermon on the Mount, who does not limit His 'goodness' to the worthy, but sends rain and fruitful seasons upon all ungrudgingly, differs in no essential respect from the 'ungrudging' Creator whom Plato had described in the Timaeus, declaring that "He was 'good' (ἄγαθος), and in a 'good' being no 'grudge' (φθόνος) toward anything ever resides, and because He was free from this He willed that everything should become as like Himself as possible." With

this we should also compare the doctrine of James i. 5, 17 f., where God is described as the "Father of lights," of unwaning radiance, who gives "every good gift and every perfect boon" and gives it 'outright' and "without upbraiding."[1] Moreover, James, like Plato, ascribes to this 'Father of lights' a will to produce in His own moral likeness. "His will was to bring us to birth (*βουληθεὶς ἀπεκύησεν*) by the word of truth, that we might be a kind of firstfruits of the things created by Him"; and by this "implanted word of truth" men's souls are saved if they "receive it in meekness" (James i. 18, 21).

Here, then, in the 'wisdom' doctrine of the Sermon on the Mount and the Epistle of James, we have a kind of salvation by 'grace'; but how utterly different a conception of 'grace' from St. Paul's! It makes no reference to the cross, has no atonement theory, ignores imputed righteousness, denies justification apart from works. The saving 'grace' of these writers may be called in a true sense our own 'grace.' It is illustrated in Luke xvii. 5–10 by the parable of the obedient slave. "Does the master 'thank' the slave because he did what he was commanded? (*μὴ ἔχει χάριν τῷ δούλῳ ὅτι ἐποίησεν τὰ διαταχθέντα*;) So also ye, when ye have done all things commanded you, say, We are slaves that have no claim to reward (*ἀχρεῖοι*), we have done what it was our duty to do." Luke's attachment of this parable to the disciples' prayer "Increase our *faith*" after Jesus' assurance of its wonder-working power (xvii. 5 f.) is very significant. It conveys this evangelist's idea of the relation of faith and works. Faith saves; but 'thankworthy' goodness (*χάρις*) must go beyond the keeping of the commandment.

A further illustration which Luke shares with Matthew

[1] Cf. 1 John i. 5, "God is light, and in Him is no darkness at all."

is the parable of the talents (Matt. xxv. 14–30=Luke xix. 11–28), the point of which is by no means the nearness or remoteness of the *parousia* (Luke xix. 11), but simply the contrast between 'profitable' and 'unprofitable' servants. Only the former have claim to reward. They alone will "enter into the joy of their Lord." To merit reward something must be done *gratis*.

On the other hand this doctrine of 'grace' has also its Godward aspect. Matthew has a special parable peculiar to his Gospel (Matt. xx. 1–16), the specific point and purpose of which is to deny that the heavenly reward is limited to the equivalent of merit, and to assert the right of God to be 'good' without limit. To those who murmur because He gives undeterred by lack of merit the answer given is this: "Is it not lawful for me to do what I will with mine own; or is thine eye evil because I am 'good' (*ἀγαθός*)?"

Moreover even the saving 'grace' exercised by man is also in a true sense God's from the standpoint of these writers. For God is the 'ungrudging' source of the disposition which produces 'thankworthy' goodness, and 'profitable' service. They are fruits of a "wisdom which cometh from above" and is "implanted in us" by "the word of truth." In response to prayer in singleness of mind God's supreme gift of His own wisdom-Spirit is bestowed as the crowning proof of His 'ungrudging,' 'unfaultfinding' goodness. Only the appropriation of it is our own. We look into the "mirror" of the divine goodness and turn not forgetfully away, but conform our lives to what we see in Him. Then 'grace' (*χάρις*), the really 'thankworthy' goodness, appears in us also. We work out our own salvation because He works in us, both willing and doing. We transcend the bare commandment, and doing our service "of goodwill, as unto the Lord," are no longer treated as slaves but as friends. Nay, we have the right to be called the children

of God; for such we are, begotten not of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.

It appears, then, that this non-Pauline conception of 'grace' (χάρις) as 'thankworthy' goodness has a twofold aspect, Godward and manward. God's 'grace' sets the standard. It is the "royal law." But it is man's 'grace,' man's conformity to the standard (itself due to divine help), which is the ground of his heavenly reward.

Since we are here obviously upon the track of a doctrine of salvation by 'grace' wholly independent of Paul, and indeed diverging from his conception of 'grace' and 'law' to an extraordinary degree, it will surely repay investigation if we trace to some extent its origin and ramifications.

1. It is worth while to note first of all that this non-Pauline conception of 'law' and 'grace' is not post-Pauline. It is true that the conception of Christianity as a *nova lex*, the "new law of our Lord Jesus Christ, which is free from the yoke of constraint" (ἄνευ ζυγοῦ ἀνάγκης)[1] comes prominently to the fore only in the post-Pauline period of James and Pseudo-Barnabas; but even a superficial study of Talmudic doctrine will show that its distinction between 'guiltlessness' and 'merit' is fundamental, and certainly pre-Christian; and this involves what we have designated the manward aspect of the conception. The whole doctrine of justification under the scribal system rests upon the principle of the preponderance of meritorious deeds. Something must be done *gratis*. While fulfilment of every commandment is theoretically possible, none but the patriarchs and great worthies of the past have ever attained to justification on this ground alone. There must in all ordinary cases be a surplus of meritorious acts, among which almsgiving, prayer, and fasting are typical. The reward of these meritorious acts constitutes a man's 'treasure in heaven,'

[1] Ps.-Barn. ii. 6.

but against this treasure must be reckoned not only transgressions requiring forgiveness, but deduction must also be made—lest fancied security relax men's patience in well-doing—for undeserved blessings experienced "now in this present time." Corresponding to these distinctions we find the Matthaean, or Jewish-Christian, form of the Sermon on the Mount placing the teaching on "acts of righteousness" (Matt. vi. 1–18) immediately after that on the divine requirement (v. 17–48); and this in turn is followed by the paragraph on "treasure in heaven" (vi. 19–34). The final exhortation begins, "Judge not, that ye be not judged" (vii. 1 ff.), showing what in the evangelist's mind is the chief motive. His eye is upon the final judgment seat. Judgment will be without mercy to him that has shown no mercy. Acts of righteousness are again divided by the rabbis into two classes, 'almsgiving' (צדיקים) and 'works of mercy' or 'grace' (גמילות חסדים) which consist of kindness to the poor, the helpless, the needy, the deserving of all kinds and stations. Almsgiving is of greater merit than all sacrifice (based on Prov. xxi. 3; cf. Matt. v. 23); but works of 'grace' (חסד) surpass even almsgiving, and that in three respects. Almsgiving involves the gift of money alone; 'grace' involves personal service. Almsgiving affects the poor only; 'grace' rich and poor alike. Almsgiving is exercised only to the living; 'grace' extends even to the dead. The same passage here quoted (*Succa* 49b) further reminds us of St. Paul's great chapter on 'charity' by adding that almsgiving itself must be mingled with 'grace' (*ἀγάπη*), otherwise it 'profiteth' nothing. Unless it springs from a motive of heartfelt kindness it has no value in God's sight.[1]

[1] For the analysis of Talmudic doctrine and the passages cited see Weber, *Lehren des Talmud*, §§ 60–61. It is interesting to observe how even the rabbinic doctrine that the minutest acts are all weighed in the

The Godward aspect of the doctrine of 'grace,' the imitation of the divine 'goodness,' does not appear in the Talmudic distinction between 'guiltlessness' (זכיות) and 'grace' or thankworthy righteousness. Instead of the freshness and charm of the outdoor life, the winsome words of the representative Child of God in contact with God in nature and daily life, the synagogue presents only the wooden system of the casuist in his lecture-room. But, form apart, the distinction of 'thankworthy' goodness from mere obedience is as obviously present in synagogue doctrine as in the Sermon on the Mount. Even in outline and sequence the whole arrangement of Matthew conforms to the late Jewish idea of 'treasure in Heaven.'

2. The second distinctive element in this non-Pauline doctrine of 'grace' is also pre-Pauline. It naturally fails to appear in rabbinic casuistry. *Halacha* is not the home of mysticism. But in the Wisdom literature it is abundantly attested, and with increasing abundance as we come down from the Persian toward the Greek period and the beginning of the Christian era. Whether we admit or deny indebtedness to the Stoic diatribe, with its stereotyped appeal to the bounty of nature as evidence of the divine goodness, and its principle of the imitation of this pantheistic Nature, there can be no denying the coincidence of this fundamental factor of the Sermon on the Mount with the teaching of earlier Jewish Wisdom writers such as Pseudo-Aristeas, Ben-Sirach, and the author of the Wisdom of Solomon. The first ten questions of Pseudo-Aristeas are all based upon the principle of the imitation of the divine 'goodness.' In fact, the reply to each of the whole series of

balance of the divine judgment is reflected in Matt. xii. 36. A mere idle word may tip the scales against a man in the final measurement of his transgressions over against his 'acts of righteousness' and 'ornaments of grace.'

seventy-two is so framed that imitation of God forms the ever recurrent burden, much as the refrain "For his mercy endureth forever" recurs in Psalm cxxxvi. We select but a few examples. Stability of rule is ensured by imitation of the unvarying gentleness of God. To show forbearance and punish with less severity than is deserved will win men back from evil and lead them to repentance.[1] Friends are won by showing kindness "as God does to the race of men, by supplying health, food, and every useful thing."[2] Gratitude is to be won, even from those whose petitions must be denied, by observing how God fulfils the worthy prayer, but reveals through dreams or oracles to those who meet denial the injurious working of their requests, and does not punish according to men's sins, nor His own power, but shows kindness. Such are a few of the first group of questions and answers in Pseudo-Aristeas. The second group follows precisely the same method as the first ten, making the rule for each ideal the imitation of the royal, limitless 'goodness' of God. We can cite but the single example of question 16 (210), "What is the disposition of true piety?" to which the answer is: "To hold that God is active and known of all in all, and no worker of evil can be hid from Him. For just as God does good to the entire world, so thou also canst be perfect if thou become an imitator of Him."

For the sake of its close relation to another passage incorporated by Matthew in the Sermon on the Mount, though forming in Luke part of a discourse on True Wealth (Matt. vi. 31–34 = Luke xii. 29–31), it is worth while to make one more extract from Pseudo-Aristeas, taken from the discourse of Eleazar the High Priest in dispatching the envoys. It is

[1] *Ps. Arist.*, 187 f. Cf. *Sap.* xi. 23, "But thou hast mercy on all men because thou hast power to do all things, and thou overlookest the sins of men to the end they may repent," and Rom. ii. 4 and xii. 11.

[2] *Ps. Arist.* 190; cf. Acts xiv. 16 f.

a typical *kerygma*, or Jewish missionary sermon, on the lines of the diatribe. Beginning with (1) the doctrine of the one God, Creator and Ruler of the world, contrasting with this (2) the worship of idols of wood and stone, and (3) the supreme folly of the Egyptians and those like-minded who worship wild beasts and creeping things, Eleazar concludes with a reference to Moses' law, which keeps Israel "free from foolish superstitions, worshipping one Almighty God, superior to all created things. Therefore do the teachers of the Egyptians, their priests, who have insight into many things, call us 'men of God,' a name not given to others, but only to such as worship the true God: for the rest are rather men of food and drink and clothing. For all their thought is fixed on these things. But those who hold our faith care not for this, and their quest their whole life long is for the work of God" (*Ps. Arist.* 132–141; cf. Matt. vi. 32 f. = Luke xii. 30 f.).

Eduard Norden, in his recent admirable work on the speech of Paul in Athens, entitled *Agnostos Theos*, has supplied a mass of literary parallels showing the stereotyped character of the typical *kerygma*. In particular the close correspondence of Romans i. 18 ff. with *Sap.* xii. 27 ff. is brought forward in demonstration of the stereotyped character of this pre-Christian Hellenistic formula propagandæ fidei. Norden does not note, however, how *Sapientia* reproduces Ps.-Aristeas, nor does he take account of the striking agreement in the employment of the conception of the τρία γένη, the threefold religious division of the human race into (1) (Greek) worshippers of idols of wood and stone; (2) (Egyptian) worshippers of beasts and creeping things; (3) (Jewish) worshippers of the unseen Creator. In slightly varied adaptations the *kerygma* can be traced down through Romans i. 18–ii. 29, the *Kerygma Petri* (*ap.* Clem. Al. *Strom.* vi. 5), Josephus (*Ctr. Apion*, Niese ii. 190–

198), *Ap.* of Aristides (1 and 10), Hermas (*Mand.* i.), Tatian (*Orat.* iv.), Athenagoras (*Leg.* 13) and the *Epistle of Diognetus* (3). That which concerns us at present, however, is simply to prove that the New Testament "royal law" of divine sonship by imitation of the absolute 'goodness' of God has its roots in the Hellenistic Wisdom literature, a development of Judaism which already before the Christian era had drunk deep of Plato and the Stoics. We have but one New Testament writing which may be classified in its entirety as belonging to the Wisdom school. So completely is this the case in the Epistle of James that some critics specially familiar with the Wisdom literature have actually denied that its author could be a Christian. The relation of the Epistle of James to the Wisdom literature, especially Ben-Sirach and Ps.-Aristeas, is as close on the one side as its admitted kinship on the other with the Sermon on the Mount. It is no accident that so many of the phrases of which we avail ourselves to interpret the thought of Christian Wisdom are borrowed from it.

We have sought thus far to make it clear that both elements of the non-Pauline doctrine of 'grace' in the New Testament, (1) the conception of 'thankworthy goodness' as distinguished from mere blamelessness, and (2) the conception of the limitless 'goodness' of God as both mirror and source of human 'grace,' are also Pre-Pauline, having their roots in Jewish and Hellenistic soil, the former appearing in rabbinic doctrine, the latter chiefly in the 'Wisdom' literature. The Christian doctrine of the 'higher law,' if we may call it such, appears with special distinctness in the Epistle of James, and in certain discourses of Jesus common to Matthew and Luke, for which modern criticism has coined the designation Q. The fact that "the Wisdom of God" is quoted by Jesus in this source (Matt. xxiii. 34 ff. = Luke xi. 49 ff.), and that His followers in it are spoken

of as "the children of Wisdom" (Matt. xi. 19 = Luke vii. 35) will not have escaped the observant.

We have now to follow up the doctrine in other Christian writings, as a means of differentiating Pauline from non-Pauline influences, and thus helping to understand the development of the faith as it comes to us in the composite form of the post-apostolic age.

The doctrine of the 'higher law' is not foreign even to the Gospel of Mark, though here, as might be expected, there is closer approximation to the Stoic distinction between man-made law and the eternal principles of Nature. It is characteristic of our second gospel that its presentation of the Way of eternal life is not given, as in Matthew and Luke, as part of the teaching in Galilee, but only later, as Jesus, after the revelation of his martyr fate, takes up the Way of the Cross. In chapter x., however, the Roman evangelist gives a series of anecdotes, all of which revolve about this subject of requirement and reward. The scribes' requirement concerning divorce in Mark x. 1–12 serves first of all to bring into sharpest contrast the ordinance of "God" in creation itself which "joins together," and the law of "man" which "puts asunder." Mark had already emphasized this contrast in the section (vii. 1–23) denouncing the ceremonial distinctions of "the Pharisees and all the Jews" as "vain worship" and "precepts of men" which "make void the word of God." In chapter x. he continues after the single example of the man-made law of divorce with the story of the Blessing of Babes (x. 13–16). It serves to illustrate the principle of dependence on the divine grace, centring on the saying, "Whosoever doth not receive the kingdom of God as a little child (i.e. without merit, as a child receives from its father) shall never enter into it." The three anecdotes which follow are closely connected, and are all con-

cerned with Reward in Heaven.[1] The anecdote of the rich young man (x. 17–22) is especially close to the theme we are considering. First of all, as in the Sermon on the Mount, the absolute 'goodness' of God is made the sole standard. Even Jesus is not to be placed on a level with the μόνος ἀγαθὸς θεός (17 f.). Over against this the young man sets his observance of the written commandments (19 f.). His blamelessness evokes indeed Jesus' love, but only with the warning that this gives no claim to reward. "Treasure in heaven" belongs only to those who use earthly wealth on the plan of the boundless goodness of God. This is the way in which Jesus would be followed (21 f.).

The disciples' comment upon the "hardness" of this higher righteousness serves to bring out (23–27) that the very disposition itself is the gift of God. He Himself must grant what He commands (27). Finally there is warning (28–31) against a false security on the part even of the very "first." The disciples' renunciations have been in part rewarded "in this present time," and though forsaking all and following even to persecution and the cross will doubtless ensure "eternal life," yet "there are last that shall be first, and first last."

The special reward of martyrdom is treated of in a paragraph by itself, separated by a third and final announcement of the Passion (32–34) from the preceding. It serves, however, as the climax of the whole series on Heavenly Reward; for it denies all claims to seats of special honour,[2] even on the part of those who have "drunk the cup" of martyrdom with Christ, and concludes with the sublime saying, "For even the Son of man came not to be ministered

[1] It is worth while to note that Matthew's parable in defence of the divine right to do good beyond man's desert (Matt. xx. 1–16) is inserted into this group.

[2] An intentional correction of the application of the saying Luke xxii. 28–30, which Matthew (xix. 28) reinserts into the context.

unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many" (35–45).

This tenth of Mark is therefore our second evangelist's exposition of the doctrine of 'law and grace,' and forms his counterpart to the antitheses of the Sermon on the Mount. It is more Pauline—or at least more Gentile-Christian—than Matthew or Luke; and yet how manifestly dependent upon the older conception. Here again we have the same fundamental doctrine in both its factors. 'Thankworthy goodness' must be more than obedience to moral requirement. God Himself is the standard. He is the μόνος ἀγαθός. Absolute goodness is an imitation of Him. There is no 'treasure in heaven' save by complete renunciation of earthly wealth, no life eternal but through death, no heavenly crown but through the cross.

The First Epistle of Peter is saturated to an extraordinary degree with Pauline thought and phraseology. And yet even First Peter has its trace of the doctrine of 'thankworthy goodness.' It is in fact but the converse of the Sermon on the Mount and its query "What thank have ye?" when the writer of First Peter urges as his principal message submissive acceptance of undeserved suffering and persecution after the example of Christ on the ground that "This is thankworthy (τοῦτο χάρις) if a man for conscience toward God suffer griefs enduring wrongfully. For what glory is it (ποῖον κλέος) if when ye sin and are buffeted for it ye take it patiently? But if ye do well and suffer for it ye shall take it patiently, this is thankworthy (τοῦτο χάρις) in the sight of God" (1 Pet. ii. 19 f.).

Still more distinctively non-Pauline is the doctrine of 'grace' as 'thankworthy goodness' in the *Shepherd* of Hermas, if only because here so completely confined to the distinction between prescribed requirements and the service of goodwill, without the introduction of the divine

factor, whether as standard or source of 'goodness.' The 'Similitude' (*Sim.* V.), in which Hermas expounds his teaching of the relation of law and grace is given *à propos* (significantly) of his undertaking to keep a fast or 'station,' and follows one on "bearing fruit unto the world to come." The Angel of repentance shows Hermas a better than his "profitless" fast which "achieves nothing for righteousness," and proceeds to relate the Parable of the Slave and the Vineyard. The Master of the vineyard on departing abroad gave commandment to his slave to fence it, giving no other commandment, and promising the slave his freedom if obedient. "When, then, he had gone away the slave took and fenced the vineyard; and having finished the fencing of the vineyard he noticed that the vineyard was full of weeds. So he reasoned within himself saying, 'This command of my lord I have carried out. I will next dig this vineyard, and it shall be neater when it is digged; and when it hath no weeds it will yield more fruit, because not choked by the weeds.'" The result of this unprescribed service of pure goodwill is that the Master of the vineyard is greatly pleased on his return, calls in consultation "his beloved Son who was his heir, and the friends who were his advisers," and proposes as a reward to make the slave joint-heir with his Son. The interpretation which the Angel subsequently furnishes to his own 'parable' explains that the "slave" is "the (incarnate) Son of God" and the vines are His chosen people. "The Holy pre-existent Spirit" is the beloved Son and heir whom God the Master took into counsel along with the archangels. This Holy pre-existent Spirit He also "caused to dwell down in that flesh which He had chosen. This flesh, therefore, in which the Holy Spirit dwelt, was subject unto the Spirit, walking honourably in holiness and purity, without in any way defiling the Spirit." The exaltation of "this flesh" (of

Jesus) into partnership with the Holy pre-existent Spirit in its own place of abode was "the reward of its service," primarily because it kept the Spirit undefiled and unspotted, but also "because it co-operated with it in everything, behaving itself boldly and bravely."

The crudity of the Christology leaves the affinity with the Jewish distinction between works of prescription and works of 'grace' (חסד) all the more apparent. In the conception of Hermas Jesus was exalted to His glorified state simply because while on earth He had kept Himself unspotted from the world, and in addition had done the works of mercy which comport with the nature of the Holy pre-existent Spirit. A similar 'reward' attends all who follow His example. As in the Epistle of James, which Hermas frequently employs, there is no doctrine of the cross whatever. The entire work, nearly one-fifth as long as the whole New Testament, has not one mention of the name of Jesus. And yet it is a devout Christian writing. And it comes from the great church of Rome, which only two generations before had had direct intercourse with Paul, both by letter and face to face. The phenomenon is extraordinary, but by no means unique. It is only the counterpart of what we see in Justin, writing but a few years later from the same church. The sub-apostolic age, confronted with Gnostic speculation, antinomian licence, and Docetic heresy, fell back, as we see Papias falling back, upon the tradition of those who had known the Lord in the flesh. "The wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus" (1 Tim. vi. 3) were its remedy for the ills of the time, as we see from the Pastoral Epistles. The succession of that tradition was largely independent of Paul. At Rome we can trace it back through Hermas to Clement, to the Epistle of James, to First Peter, to the source underlying not only Luke and Matthew, but employed in no small degree by Mark

also. Back of the Christian era we can trace the chief roots of the doctrine to the teaching of the synagogue. But this teaching is subordinated to elements which find fullest pre-Christian expression only in the Hellenistic 'Wisdom' literature. In fact we may even venture to question the assertion so confidently made in our time that of all types of Jewish literature which can be considered to have influenced the teaching of our Lord it is the apocalyptic which predominated. That may be true of His first followers, with whom the resurrection and second coming were the supreme elements of the faith; but of the teaching of Jesus, as transmitted in the earliest sources critical analysis can reconstruct, it certainly is not true. There the contrast is not so much between the present and the hereafter as between the outward and the inward. Jesus sets His own message of glad tidings over against the direful warnings of the Baptist, as the winning and gentle appeals of Wisdom in the Sapiential books contrast with the harsher notes of the denunciatory prophets and the writers of apocalypse. In short, Jesus expressly makes His disciples children of the Wisdom of God. There may, then, be value in a genetic study of some New Testament ideas whose roots appear to lead back, independently of St. Paul, to the Hellenistic teachers of Israel, who stood for humanity, inwardness, and spirituality in religion, over against the ceremonial of the Levitical system and the legalistic casuistry of the scribes and Pharisees.

B. W. Bacon.

THE TOWER-BUILDER AND THE KING.

A Suggested Exposition of Luke xiv. 25–35.

This passage has five divisions:

1st: The description of the situation ver. 25: multitudes accompanying Jesus.

2nd: His statement to them of a necessary condition of discipleship vers. 26, 27.

3rd: The two illustrations of the Tower-builder and the King vers. 28—32.

4th: A repetition for emphasis of the condition of discipleship ver. 33.

5th: A conclusion, expressed in figurative language, from the preceding thoughts. This is the saying about the salt vers. 34, 35. It seems to mean: Disciples then are desirable (cf. "Ye are the salt of the earth"); but if even a disciple have lost the vital principle of discipleship, nothing can be done with him; he is of no use in the world.

The passage closes with the familiar formula which our Lord often used after uttering especially searching words to unsusceptible hearers: "He that hath ears to hear, let him hear!"

The core and substance of our Lord's thought lies in the emphatic statement, thrice repeated, vers. 26, 27, 33, *οὐ δύναται εἶναί μου μαθητής*. (Note the emphatic position both of the verb and of the pronoun: "Cannot possibly be a disciple of mine.") His general meaning and intent are plain. He is announcing a necessary condition of discipleship with Himself. This is the stern renunciation of the claims of even the dearest earthly interests in comparison with His claim, and absolute self-dedication to His cause, even unto death. Without this one cannot possibly be a disciple of His. This must be understood, not simply as an initial

condition,—of becoming a disciple,—but also as a condition of continuing such, as the attitude constantly demanded in a disciple of His. (*v.* βαστάζει *v.* 27, and cf. Luke ix. 23, "take up his cross *daily*.") Neither is it an arbitrary requirement of His own which He might modify, if He would. The ground of the requirement lies in the very nature of the case. Discipleship with Him essentially involves self-renunciation and bearing the cross. His own mission involved Him in the same necessity. He Himself could not escape it.[1] It is not right, therefore, to regard this statement in the light of a hard and severe demand which Christ would lay upon men, like a heavy yoke. He is only saying that if men wish to identify themselves with Him, this is what it means to do so; they cannot possibly identify themselves with Him and *not* identify themselves with His cross. He does not present to men renunciation and the cross as an object of choice. He presents Himself. These possess no attractiveness, nor any virtue, in themselves, but only for His sake. Men might conceivably take these (men have done so) without Him. But He presents Himself *bearing the cross*. His disciples do not choose the cross and as a reward obtain His fellowship. They choose Him and as a consequence find the cross. And if any one wishes to be a disciple of His, he must understand and accept the necessary connexion.

But what thought are the two illustrations of the Tower-builder and the King designed to convey? And what is its relation to the statement of the condition of discipleship which precedes these illustrations in vers. 26, 27, and which again follows them in ver. 33? This paper is intended to bear on that one point alone. At this point I believe the usual interpretation goes astray, namely, it misses the meaning of the illustrations and, with that, the proper

[1] Cf. Matt. xxvi. 39: "My Father, if it be possible (εἰ δυνατόν ἐστιν), let this cup pass away from me."

connexion between vers. 26, 27, and vers. 28–32. I hope to show this and to suggest a better interpretation.

I.

According to the traditional interpretation, the illustrations convey an implied counsel to "count the cost" of discipleship. Christ is saying: "You can be My disciples only on such conditions as these. Now (He is supposed to imply) this presents a serious demand. Therefore, as a prudent man, before beginning any important enterprise, would consider carefully all that it involves, so do you consider carefully before undertaking so serious a step as this, lest having begun you fail in the end. For in that case you would be like savourless salt."

Now is this interpretation correct in finding in these illustrations an implied counsel to men contemplating discipleship, that they should count the cost; and in its consequent understanding of the connexion at ver. 28?

There are serious objections to this.

1. If we take the phrase "count the cost" in the only sense in which it can be legitimately taken here, then our Lord is represented as giving advice which it is inconceivable that He could give.

The words "count the cost" may mean, either "consider the sacrifice necessary," or "calculate the resources necessary."

Some distinguished commentators adopt the former sense. Of these Professor Bruce, in the *Expositor's Greek Testament*, may be taken as an eminent example. He writes: "The connexion is: It is a serious thing to be a disciple. *Therefore* (italics mine) consider well before you begin—the renunciation required, the cross to be borne—as you would, if wise, consider before building a tower or engaging in battle." This can only mean that our Lord is

advising contemplating disciples to consider carefully whether they are prepared, in the sense of being willing to make the sacrifice necessary.

But this idea of considering the sacrifice involved is quite foreign to both illustrations. The figures of the Tower-builder and the King are not those of men considering the *sacrifice*, but of men estimating the *resources* necessary, and considering whether those resources are adequate. This cannot fairly be overlooked in the interpretation. The men are not asking themselves whether they are *willing* to pay the cost. But "desiring" (ver. 28. *θέλων*), to do a certain thing, they are considering whether they are *able*, with the resources at hand, to accomplish it. With reference to the King, this is manifest. There is no word about counting the cost. He will deliberate *εἰ δυνατός ἐστιν*. And in reference to the Tower-builder, the phrase on which alone this inference hangs does not support it. For *ψηφίζει τὴν δαπάνην, εἴ ἔχει εἰς ἀρπαρτισμόν* is a case of the familiar idiom of prolapsis of the noun *ἀρπαρτισμόν*, and is equivalent to the English: "Calculate whether he have enough for the cost of completion." Thus even the appearance of any such idea as counting the cost, in the sense of considering the sacrifice, vanishes utterly if we keep to what is really said, and are not misled by a preconceived notion.[1]

Other commentators (Calvin, Alford) interpret the phrase accurately, in the sense of estimating the resources necessary. But upon this interpretation, our Lord would be represented as advising intending disciples, before embarking upon the enterprise of discipleship, to pause and make

[1] Note.—The only way in which the supposed counsel to count the *sacrifice* can be brought into these illustrations would be by taking the thought "whether he is able," to mean "whether he is able to *bring himself to the decision*" to make the requisite renunciation, that is, in a word, whether he is *able to will*. Good Calvinism indeed, but hardly good exegesis here!

a careful estimate of their own ability to carry it through; and if they are not quite satisfied that they are able, not to make the start.

No other deduction can be legitimately extracted from these illustrations, if they be interpreted as implying a counsel to intending disciples. Both figures imply that the only proper attitude for a man in their circumstances is that of prudent hesitancy and careful calculation: they both "sit down first," the Tower-builder to "calculate," the King to "deliberate" (*βουλεύσεται*, Mid. Voice). The question to be determined by this delay is not at all whence they may obtain the necessary help, but, whether they have the ability to succeed: the Tower-builder calculates whether he has the cost of completion; the reason for his hypothetical failure and for the consequent ridicule is, that he was "not *able* to finish"; the King deliberates "whether he is *able*." In case of a negative judgment on this point, the course suggested is, that they should not attempt the enterprise. I repeat, that if these figures, as sketched by our Lord, *imply any counsel at all* to intending disciples, by way of imitation, it can only be this counsel,—that they, like these men, pause, deliberate, calculate, and, if they cannot satisfy themselves that they are able to carry to a successful issue the difficult enterprise of discipleship, that they do not enter upon it at all.

But is it possible that Christ could mean to suggest any such course as this in reference to the matter of discipleship with Him? An attitude, in one moved to be His disciple, of calculating indecision, supposed to issue, on the one hand, in a self-confident assurance that one is able to sustain the severe demands of discipleship, or, on the other hand, if one be filled with self-distrust, in a prudent abandonment of the thought of becoming a disciple,—these seem the very opposite of the attitude which Christ desires. Every-

where He summons men, not to deliberation, but to immediate decision; not to "sit down and calculate" or "take counsel," but to rise and follow. Everywhere He demands a confidence for the future, not based on calculation, but on faith. He often warns His disciples against self-confidence and cautions humility, dependence on Himself and prayer. Discipleship is a great venture upon Him alone,—an heroic, unrecking surrender to Him,—not at all the issue of a calculated confidence in one's own sufficiency to bring to completion the Christian life. This is His invariable note. It is the note of the entire New Testament in calling men to Christ. It is the evangelistic note in all ages since. And this is quite the opposite of the attitude depicted and the counsel supposed to be implied in the figures of the Tower-builder and the King.

Christ does indeed warn men against ignorant, careless or half-hearted response to His call. But that is not to advise hesitancy and calculation. What He seeks to secure is action from the right motives and with an intelligent understanding and sincere acceptance, at least in principle, of what is involved in being a disciple of His. Men must not follow Him under the delusion of false hopes, nor from shallow impulses which do not lay hold upon the will. They must understand, that to be a disciple of His means to take up the cross for His sake. This He is here making emphatic. But He never warns men not to take this decision too hastily, as though haste might mean unwise precipitation in such a matter. How could He? For however rash a prompt and uncalculating but genuine espousal of His cause might seem in the eyes of worldly prudence, it could never seem so in His eyes. Eternal issues turn upon men's attitude to Himself, and no possible consideration of worldly values could justify hesitation or delay, still less withdrawal, at that point. He did not fear that any man might give

allegiance to Himself too hastily, but only that men might become followers without really giving allegance to Himself at all,—mere camp-followers. He is not solicitous for a carefully weighed response, but for a whole-hearted loyal one. Such a response might be impetuous or it might be deliberate, according to temperament; it might be self-confident, like Peter's, "I will die for thee," or more wisely conscious of the weakness of the flesh; it might have more, or it might have less, of intelligent appreciation of His aims and claims; it would certainly need, by later experience, to learn the meaning of obedience by the things it must suffer. But let there only be at its heart this personal loyalty which means to take up the cross and follow Him, if need be, to the death, and the prompter and less calculating it were, the better.

The familiar passage in Luke ix. 57–62 shows our Lord simultaneously in contact with the enthusiast and with the procrastinator. It well illustrates His way with each. We there see at once His insistence that one shall not follow Him under any delusion ("Foxes have holes, etc."), and also His insistence on an instantaneous and unreserved response to His call in the case of the two procrastinators. But we also see plainly, in the tone of His replies to each, that He is much more afraid of,—or rather, that He has much less tolerance for,—the spirit of hesitancy for any cause in a proposing disciple, than of a possibly mistaken enthusiasm.

Could Christ, then, have meant any such thing as the counsel here attributed to Him in the current interpretation? Especially, can we venture to attribute it to Him, when the ground for it is only an inference from two illustrations which readily admit a different interpretation?

Both Calvin and Alford, rightly interpreting the phrase "count the cost," feel the difficulty in which this lands them. Calvin writes: "I readily acknowledge that if

we calculate the expense, we are all destitute of power to lay a single stone or to wield a sword against the enemy." This is equivalent to saying that if we follow this supposed counsel, no serious person would ever venture to become a disciple of Christ's. And that is true. Alford tries to escape by saying that, in the case of an intending disciple, "the counting of the cost must always issue in a discovery of the utter inadequacy of his own resources, and the *going out of himself* for strength and means to build." Surely an interpretation reduced to such straits is in need of revision.

2. A second objection is, that upon this interpretation the main thought of the passage is left to inference. It is nowhere expressed.

At ver. 28, before the illustrations, this interpretation is obliged to interpolate: "Therefore, consider well before you undertake to be a disciple." But even then the thought does not run smoothly. After the illustrations, in ver. 33, following the words "So therefore," it must again interpolate: "Do ye the same in regard to discipleship, for, etc." Such large and important interpolations may only be resorted to if there is no other alternative. I shall show later that there is another.

But the seriousness of these interpolations does not consist merely in their mass, in proportion to the extent of the entire passage; but even more, in the way in which they are made to usurp the central place in the thought. The leading thought is not taken from our Lord's actual words,—His emphatic, categorical and thrice-repeated statement of the condition of discipleship; but this interpolated counsel to consider carefully before becoming disciples is given the central and governing place. The emphatic and repeated statement of the condition of discipleship is made subsidiary to this (supposed) counsel, and the illustrations in vers. 28–32 are then made to support

that counsel. Thus Professor Bruce says: "The counsel to deliberate is left out or latent in the requirement of renunciation, *which is the reason for deliberation.*" (Italics mine.) That is, our Lord is supposed to give the reason for His counsel, but never to utter the counsel itself. Surely it is doing violence to the thought to assign to a mere inference,—a confessed interpolation,—the central place, and to relate all the expressed utterances to that.

3. Therefore, as is inevitable, this interpretation does not fit snugly into the language actually used by our Lord.

It fails to note the *argumentum ad hominem* in the words Τίς γὰρ ἐξ ὑμῶν at ver. 28. It disregards the suggestions contained in the three main conjunctions, and supplants them by its own interpolations. Conjunctions express the relations of the elements of thought in a speaker's mind. But where the text reads γάρ (ver. 28) this interpretation assumes that the real connexion in the speaker's mind is "therefore." (See Professor Bruce above.) On the other hand, where the text reads οὕτως οὖν (ver. 33) this must insert the idea of "for" or "because."[1] Thus instead of being drawn from the conjunctions, the common interpretation, at these two articulations, wellnigh transposes them.[2] It leaves the οὖν at ver. 34 meaningless. For a long time this word was dropped from the text, doubtless because of its apparent irrelevance. Now that it is restored by the compulsion of manuscript authority (Tischendorf, W. and

[1] Hoffman tries to correct this by putting a period after the word "you," reading "so therefore every one of you" (understanding, "do the same thing as this builder and king"). The next sentence would then begin: "Whosoever renounceth not all that he hath, etc." But even Prof. Bruce says: "This is very effective: . . . but it is hardly how Luke reports his words."

[2] On the current interpretation the connexion of thought at ver. 28 is: "Only on this condition can one be a disciple, *therefore*, etc." while the *word there used* is γάρ: and the connexion of thought at ver. 33 would necessarily be: "Carefully count the cost of discipleship, *because*, etc.," while the *words there are* οὕτως οὖν.

H. and Nestle all insert *οὖν* here), we are forced to find for it a place in the thought. But this the current interpretation cannot do.[1] Likewise it gives no force to *καὶ* in ver. 34: "If even salt, etc." The force of these verbal criticisms can be better estimated in the light of the interpretation immediately to be suggested.

II.

I venture to think, that a simple turn will put us upon a better course. *Let the Tower-builder and the King be taken to stand for Christ Himself*, instead of for the intending disciple. And let the careful estimate of the possibility of success, which should be made by them before beginning, be taken as indicating the course which wisdom requires that Christ shall adopt with reference to those proposing to become His disciples, in view of the severe requirements necessarily involved in discipleship with Him. Instead of counselling men that *they* should consider carefully, before becoming His disciples, whether *they* will be able fully to meet the demands of discipleship, He declares, that *He* will consider carefully, in the case of every man, whether *He* will be able to complete the work, which, as Master, He has to do in and through His disciples,—for which alone He desires disciples. In order that He may hope to do this, He must find in the disciple the spirit of renunciation and self-surrender. Without that, He cannot carry through His enterprise with any man. Therefore, one who does not fulfil this condition cannot be a disciple of His. The moral requisites for the disciple-calling are wanting. And He, who knows men's hearts better than they themselves do, will judge each case for Himself. The illustrations,

[1] Plummer (*Inter. Crit. Com.* in loc.) makes the suggestion that it "perhaps refers to previous utterances," i.e. to utterances not found in this connexion!

then, depict the discrimination which the Master must exercise toward proposing disciples ; they do not counsel those contemplating discipleship to exercise prudence and calculation towards the Master's call.

The thought of the passage would then run thus : In view of the great crowd following Him, among whom He knew were many who would stand no sort of stress upon their loyalty, He turns and states plainly what is involved in discipleship with Him. One must cast off the restraint of the most precious earthly ties, if necessary even with the vehemence which hatred itself would inspire, and must bear his own cross (the symbol of a life devoted to death). He who does not do this " cannot possibly be " a disciple of *His*. Then, according to a common method in His reasoning with men, He appeals to their own accepted principles in justification of this condition : such a one cannot be a disciple of His, " *for* which of you " (*Τίς γὰρ ἐξ ὑμῶν*) would not exercise prudence in any great enterprise, and carefully count whether he have wherewithal to finish ? Or what king (like Himself), going to war against another king, would not first carefully consider whether he is able, with a small force, to meet an army greatly its superior in numbers ? And if he find that he can only expect defeat, he will not advance. So Christ, unless He sees that He can accomplish His work with disciples who present themselves to Him, will not be guilty of the folly of undertaking it. " So therefore whoever he be of you that renounceth not all that he hath he cannot be a disciple of mine." He would not by this be understood as not desiring disciples : but not devitalised disciples. Disciples (" salt "), then, are good. But even if disciples (" if even salt") have lost the active essence of discipleship, as they will certainly do under any other condition, nothing can be done with them (" Where-

with will you season it ? "). They are worse than useless[1] (" fit neither for the land nor for the dunghill "). The final result is that they must after all be rejected (" men cast it out "). The inference is plain : then why begin at all with such as will inevitably come to this end ? Most appropriately after such solemn sayings comes the warning : " He that hath ears to hear, let him hear." These words and these alone express the only counsel in this passage.

I venture to think, further, that the two illustrations may, without straining, be taken as suggesting the two lines on which Christ must be able to carry forward His work in the case of every disciple. He has two things to do : a work to accomplish *in* the man himself, and a work to accomplish *through* the man in the world. As Tower-builder He is working *upon* the disciple, building up His Kingdom in the man's heart and life. As King, He is working *through* the disciple, meeting with a small body of soldiers the apparently overwhelming odds which oppose the victory of His cause. Both enterprises are strenuous, and He must have men on whom He can depend to the uttermost, men detached from the restraint of all other interests and unreservedly surrendered to Him, men who have taken each his own cross for the death. Otherwise, at some point in its progress, His undertaking will break down. (Recall the seed sown upon rocky ground.) It is a severe experience for a human soul to be built up after the pattern which Christ has for it. Only those who are prepared to crucify the old man will endure the process. And if they fail, men will mock at Christ. It was apparently a warfare against enormous odds upon which Christ had entered,—from a worldly point of view, a forlorn hope. Only soldiers can be safely trusted in such a case who are ready to die rather than to turn back.

[1] Thomson says that such corrupted salt is not only worthless but destructive. *Land and Book*, Sec. xxvi.

Finally: in the imagery of the salt the main emphasis is not to be placed upon the destruction of the salt in itself, as is often done, but upon the consequences to the owner and to others of the salt becoming savourless. The passage chiefly suggests, not that so much salt perishes, but that it is rendered useless to the owner and injurious to others. And the thought that Christ would lift into prominence here seems to be, not the loss which the disciple suffers (although that is doubtless suggested), but the loss to Christ and to his Kingdom through the disciple's unfaithfulness and defection.

III.

In support of this interpretation the following considerations may be presented.

1. It is, at least, quite as natural in itself to suppose that in these illustrations our Lord is adducing a *reason for* the stringent requirement of discipleship as it is to suppose that He is deducing a *cautionary counsel from it.* It is far more natural that He should compare Himself to the builder of a great structure and to a king than that He should compare His disciples to such. Elsewhere He applies both figures to Himself (cf. Matt. xvi. 18, *οἰκοδομήσω*). He never applies them to His disciples. How inept indeed it would have been to compare these peasants and fishermen with tower-builders and kings! Yet how aptly these figures apply to Him! Furthermore, it is quite in harmony with His mind, as we know it in His other teachings, that He should represent Himself as judging men proposing to be His disciples, but quite unlike what we hear from Him elsewhere, that He should advise men to undertake a searching introspection and critical judgment upon themselves.

2. It avoids the objections to which the current interpretation is exposed.

It does not attribute to our Lord a counsel of delay and calculation in reference to discipleship, so incompatible with His consistent demand for immediate and unreserved response to His call.

It recognises the *argumentum ad hominem* at ver. 28, contained in the words *Τίς γὰρ ἐξ ὑμῶν*. The current interpretation invents a comparison here between something unexpressed and the building of a tower, instead of observing the comparison *between speaker and hearers*, actually expressed in these words. Yet this is a form of argument not uncommon with our Lord, and especially characteristic of His sayings reported in this section peculiar to Luke's gospel. And He uses it always to vindicate or explain His own ways or God's ways, by appealing to principles of conduct accepted among men. "Who of you would not do so and so under given circumstances? Even so will God do, or will I do." There is another example in this very chapter, verse five. Recall also the argument for confidence in Prayer, xi. 5 and 11, also the saying in xvii. 7, and especially the first two parables of the fifteenth chapter: "What man of you having an hundred sheep, etc.?" (xv. 4), and "What woman having ten pieces of silver, etc.?" (xv. 8). "Even so (*οὕτως*) I say unto you, etc." (xv. 7, 10). Now here is identically the same form of expression as in these other passages. In all these other cases the analogy is recognised by all expositors as drawn from *men* in given circumstances to *God* (or to Christ) in similar circumstances. In this passage only the current interpretation would have us draw the analogy from men in one situation (the tower-builder and the king) to *men* in a like situation (the disciples). But why construe the identical expression differently here from everywhere else, especially when it is made even stronger by contrast with the emphatic *μου* at the end of the preceding verse? But if we

admit its force here, then our interpretation of the passage as a whole necessarily follows.

It respects the thought relations expressed in the conjunctions which our Lord Himself uses, instead of inventing others. The main thought of the passage certainly is the thrice-repeated, doubly emphasised and categorical statement that whosoever does not fulfil certain conditions "cannot be a disciple of mine." This thought is made prominent by three-fold repetition and by the emphatic position both of its verbs and of its pronoun. It is hard to see what more could be done either to emphasise it or to give it the leading place. Then, the relation of the two illustrations to this main thought can, according to the grammatical structure, be none other than that of supporting reason to main thesis. They are *introduced* by the *causal* conjunction γάρ, which looks forward; and they are *followed* by the *inferential* conjunctions οὕτως οὖν, which look backward. The γάρ (ver. 28) compels us to see in the following illustrations dependent sentences supporting the main statement just made twice over: "Such an one cannot be a disciple of mine, for," i.e. for the reason that follows (in the illustrations). The οὕτως οὖν, on the other hand, in ver. 33, compels us to see in the main statement, therein repeated for the third time, a *deduction* from the illustrations just preceding: "So therefore, i.e. for the reason that precedes, whosoever he be of you (πᾶς ἐξ ὑμῶν ὅς), etc., cannot be a disciple of mine," i.e. because, like these men, I will carefully consider before beginning with him. Here, then, both before and after the illustrations, is double linguistic evidence, which we cannot ignore, of the direction in which the current of thought is flowing in our Lord's mind. *He must intend to embody in the illustrations His reason or justification for the stringent requirement of* vers. 26, 27, 33. *He cannot intend to make a deduction from*

that requirement, as the current interpretation assumes.

Our interpretation also gives to both οὖν and καὶ (ver. 34) their full significance.

3. In this connexion it may be noted, further, that our interpretation preserves the unity and consistency of the passage both in expression and in idea. The tone of the passage as a whole is not hortative, but strongly declarative. It consists of categorical statements only. All the principal verbs, bearing the weight of the thought, are in the indicative. There is not an optative or imperative in it, save in the closing formula "Let him hear." Moreover, all the verbs express the idea of *can*, not of *ought*,—of what is possible, not of what is desirable.[1] Our Lord, then, is teaching here, not exhorting. He is stating an objective principle of universal and independent validity, an inherent necessity of the case, which he Himself could ignore as little as could proposing disciples. On any other condition, whosoever might desire it, discipleship with Him is impossible. Thus viewed, the passage contains a single thought, emphatically declared (vers. 26, 27), justified (vers. 28–32), repeated for added emphasis (ver. 33), and guarded from misapplication (vers. 34, 35). On the other hand, the current interpretation finds here two important thoughts, one a categorical statement of the condition of discipleship, and the other a counsel (implied) to count the cost; and these two thoughts are supposed to alternate with one another back and forth: first the statement, then the implied counsel, then the statement repeated, then the evil result of disregarding the counsel. What justification is there for thus altering this tone of strong affirmation into one of mere counsel and for thus breaking up the unity of the thought?

4. Our interpretation gives at least a possible and

[1] Cf. οὐ δύναται εἶναι thrice, vers. 26, 27, 33; εἰς ἀπαρτισμόν, ver. 28; μὴ ἰσχύοντος, ver. 29; οὐκ ἴσχυσεν, ver. 30; εἰ δυνατός ἐστιν, ver. 31.

reasonable significance to both the illustrations used by our Lord. It may be correct to say that the difference between them has no significance ; but nothing is gained by such exposition. Whereas it is a distinct gain if we can discover a reason for, and a phase of meaning in each turn of our Lord's words. We at least banish tautology.

5. Several incidents in the gospel narratives reveal our Lord as actually exercising toward proposing disciples the discrimination here indicated, and not admitting indiscriminately all who present themselves. One might refer in particular to a striking illustration in John's gospel. "Now when He was in Jerusalem at the Passover, during the feast, many believed on His name, beholding His signs which He did. *But Jesus did not trust Himself unto them,* for that He knew all men, and because He needed not that any one should bear witness concerning men : for He Himself knew what was in man" (John ii. 23–25). Is not this "did not trust Himself unto them for that He knew, etc." just the attitude toward disciples depicted, according to our interpretation, in the figures of the Tower-builder and the King ? The parabolic form of teaching in Matthew, chapter xiii., seems deliberately chosen, as B. Weiss shows, partly for the purpose of serving as a touchstone to distinguish between the unreceptive and the receptive among His hearers. (*Leben Jesu*, B. iv. 2). Again, the discourse on the Bread of Life, spoken to the crowds at Capernaum who sought Him after the feeding of the five thousand, seems to have had a similar object. It certainly had that effect. "Upon this many of His disciples went back and walked no more with Him." One recalls also the case of the rich young ruler required to sell all that he had and going away sorrowful. But one hardly needs specific instances to prove this discrimination on our Lord's part. The entire ordering of His ministry, after the miracle of the feeding of the

five thousand, shows how he tried to shake off the crowd and to secure disciples who understood and accepted what was involved in identifying themselves with Him.

All this does not conflict with His assurance, "him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out." For the very point in these cases seems to be, that these men were not seeking Him, but some ulterior end through Him. They would make Him the means of advancing or attaining some object of their own; they did not propose to put themselves at His disposal for the attainment, at any cost to themselves, of His end. They did not "come" to *Him* in any real sense at all, but desired Him to go with them, and they had no intention of abandoning their own will for His where the two might diverge. And He, with his insight into men's hearts, saw this and refused to trust Himself to them.

I venture to think that the interpretation here proposed has more than merely academic interest. Thus understood, this passage, more than almost any other in the gospel, makes clear the important practical truth, that the realisation of discipleship depends ultimately on the act of the Master, whose alone is the sovereign right to admit into the relationship, and not simply upon the decision of the proposed disciple, who must receive the standing of discipleship, if at all, as a graciously bestowed privilege. "Ye did not choose me, but I chose you." The gospel is often emasculated in its presentation, and men are besought to "accept" Christ in a way which seems to imply that there is nothing more necessary for discipleship than consent on their part. Is it not needful that we be reminded, that, before anything is really effected for us, Christ on His part must accept, and that this, after all, is the decisive and vital thing? And should it not be made clearer, as He so clearly states it, that the condition of such acceptance on His side

is taking up the cross ? His yoke is indeed easy. But still there is a yoke. His way is one of liberty, joy and peace. But the gate is narrow. And does not experience prove that it is not by presenting discipleship as a mere matter of human choice, nor by easing the sternness of Christ's great condition, that men will be won to Him ; but by presenting it as a " high calling," worthy of all the sacrifice it may involve, and by maintaining His full emphasis on this essential condition of acceptance in it ? Real and deep is the response of the best that is in the human heart to the call for an heroic devotion, ready to accept death under a worthy leader in some high emprise. And it is because in all ages men have heard this note in Christ's call that they have risen and followed Him, " rejoicing that they were counted worthy to suffer for the Name."

THOMAS VERNER MOORE.

NOTE.—If the apostleship of Judas be suggested as a difficulty in the way of this interpretation, it may be said (apart from all other reference to the problem of Judas), that this interpretation does not necessarily imply that every one who does begin by sincerely taking up the cross will certainly persevere, but that no one who does not so begin can be expected to endure to the end. The case of Judas is, moreover, no more difficult to reconcile with our interpretation of this passage than with the unquestionable meaning of the statement in John ii. 23–25.

STUDIES IN CHRISTIAN ESCHATOLOGY.

V. Immortality.[1]

Immortality is in no sense an exclusively Christian idea, much less the cardinal point of Christian faith. This place is claimed for it by certain writers, as Lessing or Tennyson, who seek thereby to bring out its importance beyond cavil. But in their estimate two considerations are overlooked—first, that immortality was believed in and taught by religious men long before the Christian era, next that in any case it is subordinate, a corollary to belief in God. Always the real question has been not whether we exist after death, but what kind of existence this will be. The problem of God and the problem of immortality go together, and the argument about each, roughly speaking, has taken the same form. It has been an argument not so much as to being or reality, as rather about intrinsic nature.

For convenience we shall here use the word "immortality" instead of "resurrection," yet this does not imply that the idea of resurrection is now devoid of meaning. Its meaning is to be determined. True, resurrection is relative to body, for soul cannot be buried; and if we discard the notion that the glorified spirit will be reinvested with the very organism it wore on earth, composed of the same material particles precisely (an idea rejected explicitly by St. Paul in 1 Corinthians xv.), it may seem imprudent to keep a word which invites that old misunderstanding. Our real interest is to affirm immortality—the life after death and for ever of the redeemed personality, sinless and individual, in union with God. Further, on a variety of

[1] In this paper I have embodied one or two sentences from my booklet, *Studies in Christian Truth*.

grounds, the term "resurrection" is more wisely kept to denote Jesus' special victory over death.

At the same time, resurrection stands for truth of such certainty and value that we may be sure it will never be parted with. The whole man—soul and body in one—connotes and embraces the effective human energies developed in and by his past life, controlled and unified by the self; and these energies, faith holds, will after death retrieve and reassert themselves in forms not now imaginable. To use St. Paul's figure, out of the seed will spring a new ear of corn.[1] The total efficacy of a life, considered as a force acting on environment, is unmeaning apart from organism; and this efficacy will not perish; it will resume elsewhere its tribute to the life of the Kingdom. It is unnecessary to say, with Fechner, that the surviving spirit will be conscious of its influence as simply the aetherealisation and extension of its body; but at all events his theosophic fancies remind us that an outer mode of being necessarily belongs to spiritual life as such, and that if we think away all externality, there is an end of fellowship. Thus, belief in resurrection is a defined, even if symbolic assertion, that the life to come will be life in a body.

> The eternal form will still divide
> The eternal soul from all beside.

The Christian mind has never been really cordial about a bare dogma of the immortality of the soul. It has felt that personal life can be re-established on the farther side only as spirit is invested, by God's gift, with a perfect organism.[2] Curiously enough, no one has taken this line more distinctly than Schleiermacher. So invariably, he writes, are we conscious of the relation of our most inward

[1] We must not appeal to this passage for theories: see Metzger, *Die christliche Hoffnung*, 51 ff.

[2] For a metaphysical theory of the possibility of this, see Galloway, *Philosophy of Religion* (1914), pp. 571–2.

and profound spiritual activities to those of the body, that apart from the idea of organism we are really unable to form the conception of finite spiritual life. We imply body, indeed, when we speak of an immortal *soul*, for spirit is defined as soul only in its relation to body. One main reason of opposition to this in philosophic circles is obviously the underlying prejudice that body as such—not simply matter—is a debasing burden or limitation. But we may reasonably think of it as a principle of individuality as well as a serviceable medium of spiritual commerce, in the absence of which souls "unclothed upon" would share no life but their own.

To mention the philosophers in a discussion of immortality is at once to be reminded that the topic is one on which they differ among themselves quite as much as other people. Plato can be set against Aristotle, Leibnitz against Spinoza, Kant against Hegel, Lotze against Wundt. It is idle, then, to talk of the philosophic verdict on the point, as if a unanimous opinion had been put forth authoritatively. Here I can only make a brief reference to outstanding points in the long debate.

Speculative or scientific opposition to the everlasting hope is apt to place its first line of argument in a simple review of motives from which belief in immortality has sprung.[1] Much is made of the primitive fear of death and thirst for life; Feuerbach says we believe what we

[1] Most negative opinions on the value and destiny of the human self are rather due to a vague atmosphere of materialistic prejudice than to a careful scrutiny of the relevant considerations. Annihilation is called self-evident, because it is evident in no other way. The picture of the world that lives in many minds is determined solely by physical science; even a great psychologist like Wundt fails to rise higher. The proposal has recently been made to cure the longing for immortality, which properly is a disease, by so much improving medicine and hygiene that life will be greatly lengthened, and men will be only too glad to escape. They would gradually develop an instinct for death.

wish, and we most passionately wish to survive. Or resort is had to associations of ideas, characteristic of dream-life, where for a brief space we are reunited with the loved dead, in scenes painted from daily experience. Or it is said that death was felt to be unintelligible; its reality, therefore, was imperiously denied, as offering to thought and will an end so dark and vain as to be intolerable. Or ethical incentives of a lower kind are detected—the political intention to stimulate good behaviour, a fierce longing to see justice done to our enemies, and a not less selfish insistence that our personal merit should be recognised. Best of all, and none too good, is a sense of rebellion against the failures of life, and a wish (which can never be cleansed from egoism) to retrieve what has here been missed or lost.

So far, however, the question is obviously one of psychological fact merely, not of truth. No investigation of the causes of belief is relevant as such to the point, whether the belief is itself a right one. It may well be that assertions of immortality were at first due to motives largely egoistic, and it is certain that even the Christian hope has often been expressed in terms savouring of natural hedonism. But no chiliastic caricatures or primitive egoisms have anything to do with the real issue. Virtue is not discredited by the fact that a schoolboy may be led to virtuous conduct by hope of reward or fear of punishment, and no clear thinker can suppose that faith in immortality is lowered in moral rank by the fact that its meaning has often been very badly expressed. What is really of interest is to ascertain how far there is discernible in history a steady rise in the kind of motive appealed to, with a gradual tendency to believe in immortality for its own sake. If such a rise took place, earlier motives become negligible, and we are left asking whether the reasonableness of the world does not justify a belief found to be associated vitally

with the loftiest moral achievement. Man, in that case, has no *right* to efface his own immortality before a universe, however vast. Not only so, but Christian faith is conscious that its eternal hope is not produced by any selfish postulate ; it is the lowly and obedient acceptance of a Divine gift.

Theoretic denials of immortality—and little is gained here by distinguishing philosophy and science—may all be reduced in the end to a single axiomatic principle. This is to the effect that experience shows no faintest trace of soul-life apart from a material body. And if this be so, the two must in fact be inseparable. Of course, various points of view may seem to yield this conclusion. It may be the outcome of materialism ; but of materialism, as a reasoned theory, its philosophic critics have long since made an end. But it may also be a rider to the view known as psycho-physical parallelism. Let it be remembered that parallelism all but inevitably means a monistic metaphysic of a kind which, whether materialistic or no, cannot at least be accurately described as spiritual. The single being or essence underlying mind and matter is *ex hypothesi* not interpretable in terms of either ; for it lurks behind both as an inscrutable mystery. Thus, in McDougall's words, " an important implication of all forms of psycho-physical Monism, is that human personality does not survive the death of the body." [1] With the break-up of the series of changes we designate corporeal, there ends the mental series also, consciousness and body being only two aspects of one thing. Our reply must be confined to these points. First, the Christian faith in another life is in no way at variance with the *actual* correlation of soul and body, as a fact of universal experience, but only with a specific theory of this correlation—a theory, in any case, which rests upon highly questionable metaphysical presupposi-

[1] *Body and Mind* (1911), p. 194.

tions. In revolt from the old difficulty of understanding how soul and body can affect each other, it actually presents us with the two graver difficulties of understanding how all apparent interactions can be mere semblance, and how a single basal substance can manifest itself in two modes which stand in no conceivable mutual relation. Secondly, it is illegitimate to bring forward the parallelistic theory as an accepted scientific view. It is of course nothing of the kind. Those who reject it find themselves in very creditable company, as may be seen from Mr. McDougall's imposing list of authorities.[1] The simple fact is that no modern theory of body and mind enjoys anything like universal vogue.

The more general position, that spiritual life cannot be in separation from body, is itself a conclusion which goes much beyond the premises. We are entitled to say only that such a life is unimaginable. Personality needs organs or conditions, through which it is expressed; but from this it is a long step, and one which no law of thought bids us take, to say that no conditions save those now existing will serve. That is the argument *e silentio* with a vengeance. We commit no breach of logic, indeed, by holding that a higher type of organism may be in store for us, one more delicate and noble, and better able to reveal the soul. To quote an illustration which, by its felicity, may seem to have something of the force of an argument: "The whole question of the possibility of the continuance of conscious life after the destruction of the body is simply this—is the relationship of matter to spirit that of a cause as an engine's is to steam, or that of a medium as a prism's is to light?"[2]

But if we thus repel philosophic objections to immortality,

[1] *Ibid.*, 204.
[2] Carnegie Simpson, *The Facts of Life*, 203.

as resting on an unproved dogma, may we call philosophy as witness on the other side ? Shall we make the Christian hope dependent on speculative logic ? Not if we are wise. The philosophic " proofs " of life after death resemble those for the Divine being, on which they are modelled more or less consciously, in this particular that they apply the term " proof " to what falls far short of coercive force. The argument for immortality *e consensu gentium*, for example, is not invalidated certainly by the replies of savages to an unskilful cross-examiner, but its completeness is fatally undermined by the case of Buddhism, to say nothing of atheists or agnostics. The moral argument takes either the Kantian form, postulating an infinite life for the attainment of infinite perfection, or that of a more general contention that the unjust distribution of good and evil in this world needs to be corrected ; but to this it has been objected, even by Christian writers, that virtue and vice are exactly recompensed in the present life, while even more formidably it is argued that unless the good is absolutely valid in itself, irrespective of what the future may contain, no real basis exists for theism. The teleological argument points to that in man which asks for perfect and divine fruition ; but thinkers like Schopenhauer have accepted this, yet in a sense totally indifferent to personal survival. Finally, an ontological argument has been stated in two forms, a lower and a higher—the one analysing out immortality from the soul's nature, as a simple immaterial entity, which, having once entered on being, can never cease to be. Here it is a fair question whether the terms " simple " and " immaterial " do not also hold true of the ultimate elements of matter, as science now conceives them ; there is no necessity of thought, besides, to say that what has been must be for ever. Or stress may be laid on the immanent infinity of spirit, the unending potency

of human thought and action; and yet the question once more is whether this necessarily involves the life after death of finite persons, while its force is much diminished by the fact that, sooner or later, all human energies known to us pass into decay. Thus, of each argument we have to conclude that its value is a personal question, and this value will vary according to the respective dispositions, opinions and experiences of those to whom the argument is addressed. It is not that it contains no truth, but that the rays of truth, as one has said, "stream in upon us through the medium of our moral as well as our intellectual being." [1]

These arguments, then, do not force their way to an irrefragable conclusion. And yet they prove something. They prove how congenial the notion of immortality is to the human mind. They prove that the hope of a future life has a worth for us which nothing can replace. They prove that apart from such a hope the achievement of spirit must remain a torso. But the demonstration of survival they offer is scarcely fitted to convince the normal intellect, or to compel the agnostic by logical necessity to confess that he is in error. Some minds will be utterly insensible to its force. And in any case the Christian will not consent to base the hope of life to come upon philosophy, for no philosophy goes far enough for him. It can never give a pledge of fellowship with God. At most it offers survival, not eternal life. It misses the vital fact that there are spiritual preconditions of faith in immortality such as can never be set out in syllogistic form. On the other hand, it is now just as clear that neither philosophy nor science can justifiably interpose a veto. Negative argument is fully met by positive. Here, as so often, the use of philosophic instruments in Christian theology is not

[1] Newman, *Grammar of Assent*, 311.

to provide faith with new content, but to repel speculative objections; not to build, but to clear the ground for the builder.

Those who at this point turn wistfully to the Society for Psychical Research really miss the point at stake. They argue as if any kind of immortality were desirable, but it is not so. To the Greek mind, death was terrible, not because it brought existence to an end, but because it opened an existence wholly devoid of warmth or interest. "Speak not comfortably to me of death," are Achilles' famous words, "rather would I on earth be hireling to another, a landless man of little substance, than be chief over all the dead." [1] And for Israel there speaks the voice of Job: "Cease then, and let me alone, that I may take comfort a little, before I go whence I shall not return, even to the land of darkness and of the shadow of death; a land of thick darkness, as darkness itself." [2] It was not extinction which these men feared; it was continued being, in the absence of all that made life sweet. Those who collect evidence of survival given by spirits through mediums seem unaware that they are engaged in resuscitating the old Hebrew notion of Sheol, and casting back to the primitive animistic belief in spirits, which has at bottom nothing to do with religion, and in any case is as unlike the Christian hope of everlasting life as night to day. It is a nearly insoluble mystery how a refined intelligence like the late Henry Sidgwick, of Cambridge, could, at least for a time, turn from Jesus Christ as Revealer of the unseen to Mrs. Piper, and spend weeks, or even months, in the hopeful investigation of her ongoings. The only immortality which can interest a man that has seen Jesus, and felt God's love in Him, has no point of contact with ghosts or rappings. His faith is born in conscience, and grasps the living God.

[1] *Odyssey*, Bk. XI, 488–490. [2] X, 20–22.

It is the assurance of one who in Jesus' presence has felt his own utter guilt and fragility, yet finds the gift of eternal life put in his hand by the Father. In this light, the spiritualistic argument will always show as immoral and repulsive.

The result of this brief survey is to confirm an antecedent impression that the true basis of eschatological certainty lies in positive religion. Mr. McDougall, who is convinced that belief in any form of life after the death of the body may be gravely menaced by the progress of mechanistic dogma, writes: "I judge that this belief can only be kept alive if a proof of it, or at least a presumption in favour of it, can be furnished by the methods of empirical science." [1] This may suggest indirectly that a scientific *disproof* of immortality would close the question; but it has no other force. The assurance of eternal life belongs to religion, not science. It is anchored in revelation.

So much is clear from the fact that belief in a blessed future arose in Israel not from logic, but through spiritual experience. It did not even come as an inevitable corollary from the acceptance of one true God, to whom death itself is subject; it came from fellowship with Him. Communion with God was at first mediated through priest or prophet, and, while this continued, the certainty of union with Jehovah on the farther side of death was still unfelt. Thus, to begin with, in the Old Testament there is on the subject of the future a silence that speaks: but as soon as the individual had felt the touch of Divine communion, when he could say, "I am continually with Thee, Thou hast holden my right hand," the conditions were at last present in which the knowledge of a blessed life for the departed could be won. Of course, it came gradually at the first.

[1] *Op. cit.*, Preface.

The resurrection of individuals primarily took shape as belief in the resurrection of the martyrs. The future bliss was to be enjoyed on earth, and dead saints—those who had sacrificed everything for the good cause—would rise again to partake in a salvation which had visited the living. God would not let them lose their portion in the Kingdom. Presently, in the Book of Daniel, this was universalised as a doctrine of resurrection for all. All must rise, some to life, others to eternal loss. Apocalyptic thus strikes firmly the note of a real future for the individual.

It is only under similar conditions that this faith can be retained. When it has been lost, or is become enfeebled, it cannot be put back into the mind by itself. The man must be sure of God, as the Father who has taken him into the relationship of a child, before he can know that to this union even death can make no difference, and that Almighty Love will not suffer him to perish. So that the roots of Christian hope lie in the experience of sonship.

But in the New Testament eschatological faith has gained a new note of certainty, and quite as evidently its cause is the fact of Jesus. And what He provided was not better arguments for immortality; it was His own person, as a redeeming presentation of the Father. His disciples, who were Jews and had not been Sadducees, had no need to be convinced that man lives after death. Still their faith derived from Jesus, in two ways, a new certitude and a new quality.

The first fact to tell upon them was Jesus' own belief. The deepest word in the New Testament respecting immortality is that word concerning God; "He is not the God of the dead, but of the living." [1] It enunciates a principle which Professor A. B. Davidson used to call an Old Testament commonplace—the principle, namely, that to be possessed

[1] See the whole passage, Matt. xxii. 29–33.

by God is a relationship that can never end. I have actually read a plea by an able man that the passage containing Jesus' dispute with the Sadducees must be late, because it makes Him quibble like a Jewish lawyer.[1] Admit that in form it exhibits just so much subtlety as may enter in an *argumentum ad hominem*, what does Jesus mean to say? He says—illustrating the truth from far-off times—that he to whom God has once given His favour is one with Him for ever. If we were not so familiar with our Lord's words, I think they would astonish us. They reveal such a thought of God and of man, and of the relation of one to the other, as includes immortality as a simple part of itself. A God who at last could leave men in the dust would not be the God whom Jesus knew. That the dead are raised is for Him no longer a matter for inquiry, but a part of filial trust. His words are not properly an argument; they are a revelation, as if it became Him not to argue. What He says is true for His own mind not on intrinsic grounds of logic, not as probably true, or partially true, but as absolutely certain knowledge, certain in a sense in which nothing else can be certain except His apprehension of the Father.

Can we overestimate the importance of this fact that He who knew God best, and most loved Him, was sure of the life everlasting? Say what you please of the absurdities which, in theology, have gathered round the belief; they all vanish, as negligible and irrelevant accretions, in presence of His faith. Earnest men will always find in Jesus' certainty a sure ground of hope which no speculative objection can affect.

Jesus' experience of God, therefore, is the last and final fact in this region. We may discuss immortality apart from it, but it is like discussing the chance of wedded happiness apart from love. Modern religion is in peril of drifting

[1] Cf. J. Weiss in *Die Schriften d. N.T.*, I. 172.

from Jesus' real thought of God, of keeping His revelation of boundless grace, but dropping out His faith in almighty power. Yet for Him the one was as real as the other. Titius is simply reporting the mind of Christ as the gospels exhibit it when he says, commenting on His belief in miracle: "The world—nature—is in God's eyes nothing, and He alone is omnipotent Lord." We speak in His sense, therefore, if we say that the Divine love, acting in man's experience, enables him to conquer death not merely by providing internal consolations, in virtue of which he dies bravely or uncomplainingly; it conquers death by lifting man beyond its sway. It overcomes the last enemy by inaugurating for those who die a new career.

The second fact to tell on the apostolic mind is Jesus' resurrection. Now it is a problem of great moment, what is the exact relation between the rising of Christ from the grave and our faith in immortality? The statement is often made that the resurrection is the ultimate basis of our hope to live again; but, while this has a good sense enough, it is after all an abbreviated form of expression. It is roughly rather than precisely true. In strictness, Jesus' resurrection is not the last ground of hope, for it is itself grounded in a reality still more ultimate. Long ere He died, Jesus knew that He would rise again, and He knew this because of His relation to the Father. It could not be that God would leave His soul in the grave. The same thought reappears in St. Peter's speech on the day of Pentecost. "God raised Him up, having loosed the pangs of death; because it was not possible that He should be holden of it." Why not possible? Because God is what He is, and Jesus His beloved Son. Hence, for the Christian consciousness, there is in this realm something more final even than the resurrection of our Lord. Behind the triumph of the Saviour stands the character of God. Every-

thing, including that last victory, comes out of Almighty Love.

Yet while the resurrection of Jesus is not the final resting-place of thought, the place it fills in the array of evidence is crucial. It does not *prove* immortality, as if apart from it that hope had no sufficient ground ; but it adds incalculably to its hold upon our mind. It is a tangible defence of our belief. It is associated with that belief in such a sense, so fortifies and illustrates it, that it acts as a vivid apprehension acts, giving it luminousness and force. The experience of Jesus was a test case, and, like every test case, it fixed a principle. It did not create that principle ; yet it decided what it should mean for the world. We know that men are brave, but to see a heroic action quickens the knowledge amazingly. In like manner, he whom God is holding by His right hand is sure of life without end, but the spectacle of Jesus' actual resurrection gives to his prior faith a new intensity of feeling. It makes his hold upon it more living, so that he dares to apply it to the darkest aspects of experience—to sorrow, to tragedy, to ignominy and pain. The world is now transfigured in his eyes. To St. Paul, as has been said, " the Resurrection is a great creative act of God, a new influx from the world of spirit breaking into the world of time, and piercing its dreams."

Nor can we fail to ask what the effect would have been had Jesus not risen. Had death silenced Him, as it silences all the rest, would trust in immortality have remained intact and unshaken ? In face of such questions we understand better what is meant by saying that the experience of the historic Christ reveals immortality in being. The spell of death is broken. " The Lord's doing " is " wondrous in our eyes "—wondrous for its own supernaturalness, but also for its place in our minds as the great instance. It is one thing to know that spring is coming, because the almanac tells us

so ; surely it is another, some sweet April day, to feel upon the brow a gust of vernal air, with its mystic fragrance, telling that spring is here.

H. R. Mackintosh.

THE PARABLE OF THE PRODIGAL SON.

That parable of our Lord which goes by the name of the Parable of the Prodigal Son begins with these words: "A certain man had two sons" (St. Luke xv. 11). It is true that the greater part of the parable is the story of the fortunes of the younger son, commonly called the prodigal, though he is not so described in the parable. But while this is so, we must not lose sight of the fact that a quite considerable part of the parable has to do with the other, the elder, son ; and indeed the point of the parable is in danger of being missed unless we bear this fact in mind. If thirteen verses are taken up with the wanderings and return to his father's home of the younger son, no fewer than eight deal with the elder brother, whose envy, provoked by the father's welcome of the long-lost son, has to be reproved and corrected. Indeed it is not too much to say that these last eight verses contain the real lesson of the parable. I am not suggesting that the story of the prodigal son is not an essential part of the parable. That would be absurd indeed. But I contend that the main point of the parable is to be found in the dialogue at the end of the parable between the father and the elder son.

The fifteenth chapter of St. Luke contains three parables —that of the lost sheep, that of the lost piece of silver, and the one under consideration. These parables our Lord spoke in reproof of the murmurings of the Pharisees and the scribes, who complained: "This man receiveth

sinners and eateth with them." All three parables aim at correcting the wrong temper of mind underlying this complaint. The spirit which those who thus murmured displayed was fundamentally wrong. If was of the earth, earthy. In heaven there is great joy over each repentant sinner, but the children of men, who know not the love of the great God and Father in heaven are filled with envy when favour is shown to the wicked man, who turns from his wickedness.

The publicans and sinners of course correspond with the younger son of our parable, the Pharisees and scribes with the elder son. The former had gone astray from God, but were now coming to themselves and returning to Him. The latter prided themselves on their nearness to God. They were like the elder brother of the parable who had stayed at home. But their murmurings, like those of their counterpart in the parable, showed how little they had imbibed the spirit of the home. If they were *in* it, they were not *of* it. Their minds were indeed carnal. This carnality had to be exposed and corrected. There was no room for it in the Kingdom of Heaven, the true temper of which is that of the Angels who rejoice with great joy over one sinner that repenteth. Man, carnal man, grudges to a repentant sinner the full and free forgiveness which the heavenly Father bestows upon him; not so the Angels in heaven, who reflect the Father's mind of love, and with Him joy, with true spiritual joy, that Love has triumphed. The temper of earth is thus contrasted with the temper of heaven. Man grudges to repentant sinners what the Angels of God delight to see him receive.

The parable divides itself naturally into two parts. The first has to do with the younger son, his attitude to his father and his father's attitude to him. The second concerns itself with the elder son and his attitude towards

his father and his younger brother, whose welcome home is unwelcome to him, even as Christ's reception of the publicans and sinners was unwelcome to the Pharisees and scribes.

The younger son had demanded independence of his father. Wishing to go his own way he had asked his father for that portion of the family substance which fell to him. The father then divided his living between the two sons. The elder brother remained at home, but the younger preferring independence, taking with him all that his father had given him, took his journey into a far country; and there he wasted his substance with riotous living. When he had nothing left, a mighty famine arose, and for the first time in his life he began to be in want, He was reduced to hiring himself out to feed swine, and so hungry was he that he could have eaten the food that the swine ate. Thus by his misery he is brought to himself, and he reflects on his folly in ever leaving his father's home where even the hired servants had bread enough and to spare. Better far to be at home as a servant than destitute in this far country. He determines to return home and confess his fault to his father and ask to be received back again, no longer as a son—that he feels he does not deserve—but as a servant. He returns. The father, who sees him while he is still far off, runs to meet him, and falling on his neck welcomes him home with a kiss. He makes his confession to his father; "Father, I have sinned against heaven, and in thy sight: I am no more worthy to be called thy son." But it would seem that his lips failed him, and refused in the face of the father's love to make the suggestion that he should become as a hired servant. It is as a son, a son still beloved in spite of his waywardness, that the father receives him back, and so great is his joy at the return of his son that he gives orders to his servants to bring forth

the best robe and put it on him, and to put a ring on his hand and shoes on his feet, and to bring the fatted calf and kill it that they may eat and make merry. For his son who had been as one dead is now alive. He had been lost but is now found.

The earthly father of the parable stands for the Father in heaven who rejoices over the return of His children to the bosom of His love. They had gone astray from Him, seeking their good apart from Him, away from the home. But they have, like the prodigal son, come to great misery and learnt the uselessness of their attempted independence. Not knowing the Father's love, they had sought their good away from Him, but now they have learnt their mistake. How can He do less than an earthly father would do? Through all his waywardness and self-will the child is still the object of the Father's love, which is only hindered in its operation until such time as the child comes to a proper mind. The love is always there, even when hindered.

And now the elder son comes upon the scene. Returning from the field he draws nigh to the house and hears the music and dancing. So he calls one of the servants and inquires the meaning of these things. On being told that his brother has come home and that his father, in joy at his return, has killed for him the fatted calf, he is angry and refuses to go in. His father then goes out to him and entreats him to come in and share in the rejoicing. But he would not. Why should there be joy over the return of a prodigal who had disgraced his family? He himself had not behaved in any such way. He had stayed at home and faithfully served his father, who had never even given him a kid, that he might make merry with his friends. "But when this thy son"—and there is a tone of contempt in the words as if he would say: This is no brother of mine though you call him so, you may call him your

son, if you will, though I am surprised that you should own him—"when this thy son came, which hath devoured thy living with harlots, thou killedst for him the fatted calf."

And then comes the father's answer: "Child (τέκνον), thou art ever with me and all that I have is thine."

There is a wealth of spiritual teaching in this reply. The favour shown to the returning prodigal in no way deprived the elder son of anything. He had all that he could possibly desire. He had but to ask and he would receive. But though he was in the home, he was not truly of it. He did not share the spirit of his father. If he has done his father's commandments he has not in so doing acted from love. If he loved his father he would have rejoiced with him. His aims are of the earth, earthy.

And here, as I said at the beginning of this paper, is the chief lesson of the parable. They who murmured at God's welcome of the sinner who returned to Him, knew not the mind and heart of the Heavenly Father. Their service was not of the right kind. It did not proceed from love. They had not learnt the first and great commandment to love God with all the heart and soul and mind. They thought of themselves as deserving of reward, instead of rejoicing to have been allowed to serve. Their service was of the wrong kind, and did not proceed from a right motive.

And what a depth of meaning there is in those words; "Child, thou art ever with me, and all that I have is thine!" This is just what our Heavenly Father says to us His children. But it is only as we accept the relationship implied in the word "Child" that we can lay hold of the privilege placed within our reach. God would have our love in response to His love to us. He does not want a perfunctory service. The mercenary spirit is wholly out of place in the Kingdom

of Heaven. If we but had the true spirit of sonship in our hearts what blessings might not be ours! But our surrender to the Divine Love is so imperfect that we are incapable of receiving the full blessing which it designs for us. Not until we have learnt to say to our Heavenly Father "All that I have is Thine" can we rightly receive the word which He speaks to us, "All that is Mine is thine."

All blessing in the Kingdom of Heaven is of grace, and any attempt to have an independent goodness of our own is foredoomed to failure. So great is the love of our Father in heaven for us that He would have us know it and recognise it, and receiving our every good consciously and thankfully from Him do all from the motive of love, which is the response to His love for us. Envy and jealousy are wholly and entirely out of place. If another is loved, this should be a cause of joy to us. The blessing which one receives deprives not another. To each and all who surrender to the Divine Love without reserve is the word spoken: "Child, thou art ever with Me, and all that is Mine is thine." It is impossible for us to accept this position of utter and entire dependence except as love, answering to love Divine, makes it easy for us.

E. H. Askwith.

NOTES ON THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

XI. The Sabbath Cure at Bethesda (v. and vii. 15–24).

(1) The reason for transposing chapters v. and vi. and for adding vii. 15–24 to v. has been given in the previous article; and the suggestion has been offered that the feast mentioned in v. 1 was Pentecost. As no disciples are mentioned, and the man cured does not know his benefactor, it is likely that this visit too, like the next at the Feast of Tabernacles, was made "not publicly, but as it were in secret" (vii. 10). The explanation of the troubling of the waters in verses 3 (last clause) and 4, which might be used to charge the evangelist with so ready a credulity, is absent from the best MSS. How Jesus knew that "he had been now a long time in that case" (verse 6) we are not told. We might suppose that here again the evangelist assumed supernatural knowledge, but γνούς is the verb used. It would seem that compassion moved Jesus spontaneously to offer the cure in awakening the desire for it. The warning in verse 14 indicates that Jesus had knowledge of the man's past, but how gained we are not told. That the act of cure on the Sabbath provoked hostility is entirely in accord with the Synoptic representations. Jesus' justification in verse 17 carries us into another circle of ideas than the defences of Sabbath cures afford in the Synoptic records; but in vii. 22–23 the defence offered is of the same kind as was usual in Galilee. That Jesus claimed His Father's example, the constant beneficent activity of God in nature, as a justification of His own act is, however, not itself improbable, especially in view of the probability mentioned in the last article, that He in Jerusalem, in face of more violent embittered opposition, asserted His claims more openly and

persistently than He did in Galilee, when these claims being misunderstood might lead to an undesired Messianic movement. If the evangelist accepts the interpretation of the words which Jesus' opponents put on them, that in claiming to follow the Father's example Jesus was claiming to be equal with God (verse 18) the context itself justifies our refusing to follow him, for throughout the discussion which follows it is the Son's dependence on, and submission to the Father which is insisted on. If we find the ὁμοούσιον here our exegesis is dogmatic, and not historical. That the saying aroused so violent an outburst of hate shows that there must have been previous controversy, and that there was gathered fuel of hate, ready to kindle at the feeblest spark.

(2) Can we accept the discourse in verses 19 to 47 as an accurate report? What at once strikes us in reading the passage is the twofold mode of Jesus' reference to Himself. In v. 30–47 and in vii. 15–24 He speaks of Himself in the first person, and in verses 19–29, apart from the introductory formula, "Verily, verily I say unto you" (vers, 19, 25), He refers to Himself in the third person, except in verse 24, which, as faith is set forth as the condition of eternal life, presents no difficulty, and may be at once accepted as a saying suitable on the occasion. But is the exposition in these other verses of the intimate and absolute relation of the Father and the Son, with its reference to the future judgment and the future resurrection, at all likely to have been given by Jesus to His opponents? Even if less reserved in Jerusalem than in Galilee, is it credible that at this stage He so entirely cast off reserve, especially when such language could provoke only deeper misunderstanding and keener hostility? So apposite is Jesus' speech in the Synoptics, that we must suspect in the Fourth Gospel utterances which do not seem necessary or relevant to the occasion. Does not the use of the third person throughout

in the balancing of Father and Son in their mutual relation appear much more credible as a later doctrinal development, in reflexions of the evangelists, or, possibly, some reminiscences of intimate talk of Jesus with His beloved disciple at a later date than as a speech in public by Jesus Himself ? Without assuming that verses 30–47 are a *verbatim* report, it seems to the writer we may accept them as a substantially accurate account of the controversy of Jesus with His opponents. The same assumption seems justified as regards the sequel of the controversy in vii. 15–24, which, however, need not have followed immediately, but after a short interval of time.

XII. The Controversy at the Feast of Tabernacles (John vii.–viii.).

(1) It has already been maintained that vii. 1 is the sequel to vii. 24, and that vii. 15–24 continues the story of v. 1–47. It was the attempt made on His life at the Feast of Pentecost in Jerusalem which led Jesus, not only to withdraw to Galilee (vii. 1), but also to abandon what seems to have been the usual practice of going up to the feast with the Galilean pilgrims (ver. 10) ; and the precaution was wisely taken, as His opponents were on the outlook for Him (ver. 11). The attitude of His brethren here described (*vv.* 3–8) is also attested by Mark iii. 31–35 ; and His refusal to be guided by their advice is exactly paralleled by His reply to His mother at the marriage in Cana (ii. 4), in which also His sole and entire dependence on God is asserted. An intimation of the divine will that He should go to the festival, accompanied doubtless by an assurance of the divine protection if He went, is probably the explanation of the change of plan. We cannot conjecture what change of conditions made it safer for Him to appear publicly at the middle of the Feast than at the beginning. Possibly the presence of

larger numbers of friendly pilgrims may have offered some security, and His non-appearance at the commencement may have for a time thrown His enemies off their guard, so that He gained His brief opportunity of appealing to the people before steps were taken to seize Him (see *vv.* 43–46).

(2) We seem in these chapters to be in the region of historical probability, and only a few matters claim closer scrutiny. We may note how carefully the writer distinguishes the different currents of opinion. In vii. 12 the phrase "among the multitudes" is used to describe "the different groups of strangers who had come up to the festival, and such as consorted with them" (Westcott's *St. John*, p. 117), and a conflict of opinion is here recorded. The Jews (*vv.* 11 and 13) are the openly and bitterly hostile party, described in verse 26 as *the rulers*, and composed, according to verse 32, of the *chief priests and the Pharisees.* "The combination occurs also in St. Matthew (Matt. xxi. 45; xxvii. 62). The phrase probably describes the Sanhedrin under the form of its constituent classes" (ibid., p. 121). The Pharisees were the democratic party in close contact with the people, and so kept well informed of the popular opinions (vii. 32; viii. 13); and through them the aristocratic party of the priesthood was moved to action. In vii. 25 another group is mentioned, distinguished on the one hand from the multitudes, the pilgrims, and on the other from the members of the Sanhedrin, and described in the phrase τινὲς ἐκ τῶν Ἱεροσολύμειτων, citizens of Jerusalem "who were acquainted with the designs of the hierarchy, and yet not committed to them" (ibid., p. 120). Probably the evangelist himself was in close contact with this group; and may even have been seeking to influence it to a favourable judgment. The opinions ascribed here would not be spoken openly; and how could one of the Galilæan disciples become aware of what was being thus

privately discussed? While the term Jews is usually applied to the hostile party of priests and Pharisees, in viii. 31 it is used of a group, whose hostility, if it had existed, had been so far overcome that they *had believed Him* (τοὺς πεπιστευκότας αὐτῷ Ἰουδαίους). But their belief is distinguished from the faith of "the number" who "believed in Him" (ver. 30), πολλοὶ ἐπίστευσαν εἰς αὐτόν, if we may assume that "the change in the construction of the verb" has some significance. According to Westcott, this group "acknowledged His claims to Messiahship as true, were convinced by what He said, but still interpreted His promise and words by their own prepossessions" (p. 133). In the warning Jesus recognises the imperfection of their faith; and their quick resentment at His speech shows the superficiality of the impression made on them (ver. 33). To the writer it seems incredible that if the evangelist was not an eyewitness, and had no concern for historical reality, he should so carefully have distinguished the varied and varying attitudes assumed towards Jesus, and have presented them with such striking verisimilitude.

(3) A second indication of trustworthiness is surely to be found in the figures in which Jesus made His appeal to the multitude. In vii. 37 He offers Himself as *the living water*; and in viii. 12 as *the light of the world*. The appropriateness of the first may be indicated in the words of Dods. "On each of the seven feast days water was drawn in a golden pitcher from the pool of Siloam, and carried in procession to the Temple, in commemoration of the water from the rock with which their fathers in the desert had been provided. On the eighth day, which commemorated their entrance into a 'land of springs of water' this ceremony was discontinued. But the deeper spirits must have viewed with some misgiving all this ritual, feeling still in themselves a thirst which none of these symbolic forms quenched,

and wondering when the vision of Ezekiel would be realised, and a river broad and deep would issue from the Lord's house" (*Expositor's Greek Testament*, vol. i., p. 767). As regards the fitness of the second figure, the same writer's words may be given. "Notwithstanding Meyer and Holtzmann, it seems not unlikely that this utterance was prompted by the symbolism of the feast. According to the Talmud, on every night of the feast the Court of the Women was brilliantly illuminated. . . . This brilliant lighting was perhaps a memorial of the Pillar of Fire which led the Israelites while dwelling in tents" (ibid., p. 773). The evangelist was assuredly one who was thoroughly familiar with Jewish customs, and also with the mode of the teaching of Jesus, whose language was always appropriate to the occasion and to the environment, as the Synoptic teaching shows.

(3) In spite of these two indications of historical trustworthiness, it may be urged that the crucial test is the language put in the lips of Jesus; and on this question several considerations must be offered. (*a*) It is evident that short, crisp, and clear sayings, such as those given in the Synoptic Gospels, could be much more distinctly remembered than controversies such as are here recorded; and we cannot assume a verbal exactness, only a substantial accuracy. (*b*) The sharpness of the tone of Jesus, the severity of His judgment throughout this controversy does undoubtedly present a difficulty. Could these words fall from the lips of *the meek and lowly in heart?* The possibility must be admitted that the evangelist in his passionate devotion to his Master, and his no less vehement indignation against his Master's enemies, may have unconsciously exaggerated the polemic character of both the spirit and the content of Jesus' teaching. But it must also be remembered that Jesus combined severity with gentleness, and even of His

earthly ministry we might use the paradoxical phrase " the wrath of the Lamb." We must not forget His woes on Chorazin, Bethsaida, and Capernaum (Matt. xi. 20–24), and His terrible denunciation of the scribes and Pharisees at the close of His ministry (xxiii. 1–36) ; also His solemn warning about the unpardonable sin against the Holy Ghost (xii. 31–32). The hostility in Jerusalem was more persistent, vehement, and ruthless than any experience in Galilee. As it came from the rulers, the teachers, and the leaders of the nation, it was more fatal to the acceptance of Jesus as Messiah by the Jewish people. These enemies were responsible for the rejection of Jesus, and the doom which would fall on the nation. The lament over Jerusalem (Matt. xxiii. 37–39) follows the denunciation of the scribes and Pharisees ; it was Jesus' compassion for the people which intensified His indignation against *the blind leaders of the blind.* We abstain from judging, because we know that we ourselves deserve to be judged. Surely the sinless and perfect had a right to condemn as no man has. His insight enabled Him to know the unreality both of the piety and patriotism under which pride, greed, conceit, censoriousness, self-indulgence and self-interest hid themselves. The Synoptic records leave unexplained the hatred that did Jesus to death ; but John's record of the controversy in Jerusalem offers an intelligible explanation. Are we not, in finding a difficulty in the severity of Jesus, condemning our own moral and religious standpoint ? Was not His burning indignation against falsehood, wrong and hate the reverse of the moral perfection of which passionate devotion to God, truth, and goodness was the obverse ? Just because He as Son was so certain of God as Father could He be so confident in His judgment of those who not only rejected that Fatherhood in Him for themselves, but stood in the way of the acceptance by the people of the blessings of that Fatherhood.

(*c*) Just because in this controversy the final issue of His acceptance or rejection as Messiah was involved, Jesus now begins to lay aside all reserve and restraint, and uses the whole of His resources of argument, appeal, and authority. It is not improbable too that the more His claim of sonship was contradicted and challenged, the more distinct, confident, and dominant would His self-consciousness become. To the writer it does not seem at all improbable that the intuition of pre-existence, expressed in viii. 58, the certainty that His relation as Son to Father was not temporal but eternal, antecedent to the very beginnings of God's revelation to the chosen people, flashed upon Him as a gleam from heaven, when the shadows of unbelief and hate were gathering thick and close around Him (see for further discussion *Studies in the Inner Life of Jesus*, pp. 85–86). Accordingly the writer does not find in the reports of these chapters teaching about the person of Jesus which seems to go beyond what was possible and even necessary for the occasion.

(*d*) It is not necessary for the present purpose to discuss the passage vii. 53–viii. 11, as the generally accepted conclusion of scholars is unhesitatingly accepted; but it may be pointed out that the intrusion of a passage not authentic affords some justification for the assumption here being made, that there are displacements in the text of the Gospel, and that we may without rashness attempt to restore the order of the original document.

XIII. Controversy at the Feast of Dedication (John ix. and x.).

(1) The incident recorded in the 9th chapter leaves a vivid impression of historical reality; the development of the faith of the man born blind, to whom sight was given, is described in a most convincing way. As the incident closely connects itself with the teaching given in chapter x

and the note of time in verse 22 fixes the date of that teaching, we may treat both chapters as an account of a visit to Jerusalem at the Feast of Dedication. The disciples mentioned in ix. 2 need not be the twelve, the companions of Jesus in Galilee, but may be Judæan disciples, including probably the evangelist, whose account here seems to be given at first hand. Dr. Moffatt, in his *New Translation of the New Testament*, makes a transposition which seems justified. He connects x. 19–29 directly with ix. 41. An appropriate comment on Jesus' action and speech in chapter ix. is offered in x. 19–21. Verses 22–29 follow quite naturally on 19–21 ; verses 26 to 29 continue the thought of verses 24 and 25, and very appropriately lead up to the teaching in x. 1–16. Also it seems more probable that such a declaration as "I and My Father are one" (ver. 30) would follow on the frank declaration of His intention to lay down and take up His life again (v. 18), than on the assurance of God's supreme power over all. Altogether there is a decided gain in the continuity of the teaching by this rearrangement.

(2) The passage in chapter x. 1–16 is interesting as an example of the allegory into which, according to the Fourth Gospel, Jesus expanded His metaphors. Doubtless it was of the blind man, who had fully and freely confessed his faith, Jesus was thinking when He spoke of the sheep who listened to His voice ; and of the constancy of His sorely tried faith when He gave the assurance that no one could tear them out of His hand, because God's strength was His (x. 27–29). In the Fourth Gospel there are no parables exactly similar in structure to those in the Synoptic Gospels, and we may raise the question, whether and why Jesus avoided in Judæa a mode of teaching so attractive and effective ? Is it not more probable that the evangelist, transforming reminiscence by reflexion, has changed parables into allegories. This at least is Wendt's opinion in regard to this

passage, for he finds here companion parables. "The first of these parables (*vv.* 1–5) describes how the sheep obey and follow only the shepherd who enters by the door into the sheepfold, while the one who breaks in by another way is a stranger and a robber, from whom the sheep flee. Its application, according to the explanation in verses 7–9, is that Jesus is the one essential Mediator of salvation for men: 'I am the door; by Me if any man enter in he shall be saved, and shall go in and out and find pasture' (ver. 9). But since this comparison of Jesus to the door of the sheepfold, which in a merely passive sense gives entrance to the flock, makes no account of the devoted care with which Jesus ministers salvation to His people, therefore this additional idea is brought out by a second parable (from ver. 10), in which the same figure of a sheepfold is employed in another relation. As the good shepherd, in contrast to the robber who will only injure the flock, and in contrast to the careless hireling who leaves it in the lurch in time of danger, devotes his life to the welfare of the sheep; so Jesus exhibits Himself as the true Saviour, in lovingly devoting His life for them" (*The Teaching of Jesus*, pp. 128–129). To this statement we must add that it is quite probable that verse 9 is a genuine logion, but from another context. Would not Jesus have confused His hearers, if, just after calling Himself the Shepherd, He had called Himself the door also? The transition from the one parable to the other must be conceived differently from Wendt's suggestion. The first parable is that of the sheep in relation to the shepherd; the second of the shepherd in relation to the sheep. Wendt does not point out clearly enough how the evangelist has altered the parabolic form; probably in the original form the first personal pronoun was not used, as in *vv.* 10–11, 14–15; but a description of the Good Shepherd's ways was given in the third person; and the evangelist has blended explanation

and parable. So restored, the companion parables would fall into the first of the two classes which Wendt distinguishes, that which gives " a rule in frequently recurring cases " (p. 117).

(3) The intimation of the voluntary sacrifice (x. 17, 18) follows easily and simply on the teaching about the Good Shepherd, and is appropriate to the occasion. His enemies were purposing and intriguing for His death. Jesus admits to them that they will accomplish their end; but He is concerned to make plain to them that the death they are seeking to inflict will nevertheless be a voluntary sacrifice on His part in loving obedience to God and loving solicitude for man. There is nothing incredible in such teaching at this time. Nor is the declaration, " I and My Father are one " (v. 30) improbable, if we do not impose on it the doctrine of difference of person in unity of substance; but understand it as the context indicates. It is unity of purpose that is primarily referred to, whatever metaphysical inferences may or may not legitimately follow. The Son's obedience to the Father's commandment makes Him one with the Father. His opponents were not sound Christian theologians. He did not make Himself God in the sense they meant. He does not place Himself merely on an equality with *the persons to whom the word of God came*; but it is as *sanctified and sent into the world* that He claims to be the Son of God (*vv.* 34–36). The mutual indwelling of Father and Son (ver. 38) is not unity of substance. It is not the correctness or otherwise of the orthodox formula which is in question here; but the historical exegesis of the passage. The claim rightly interpreted is not historically improbable.

ALFRED E. GARVIE.

INDEX.

PAGE

Rev. Edwin A. Abbott, D.D.
Miscellanea Evangelica: a Reply 166

Rev. E. H. Askwith, D.D.
On Two Points in 1 Timothy i. 377
The Parable of the Prodigal Son 552

Rev. Professor B. W. Bacon, D.D.
The Apostolic Decree against Πορνεία 40
The "Single" Eye 275
'Thankworthy' Goodness 502

Rev. Professor W. Emery Barnes, D.D.
David's 'Capture' of the Jebusite 'Citadel' of Zion . 29

Right Rev. J. H. Bernard, D.D., Bishop of Ossory.
The Example of Christ in Prayer 494

Rev. T. H. Bindley, D.D.
A Study in 1 Corinthians xv. 174

Rev. Professor T. Witton Davies, D.D.
The Words "Witch" and "Witchcraft" . . . 19

Rev. G. E. Ffrench, B.D.
Christianity before the Gospels 401

Rev. Principal A. E. Garvie, D.D.
Notes on the Fourth Gospel . . 148, 233, 335, 453, 558

T. R. Glover, M.A.
Discipline in Prayer 126
The Call of God 365

Professor Rendel Harris, Litt.D., D.D.
Some Remarks on the Text of Apocalypse iii. 17 . . 160
New Points of View in Textual Criticism . . . 316

Rev. Maurice Jones, M.A., B.D.
Harnack on the Dates of the Acts and the Synoptic Gospels 193

Rev. Professor H. A. A. Kennedy, D.Sc., D.D.
St. Paul and the Conception of the "Heavenly Man" . 97

Rev. Professor Ed. König, D.D.
Image-Worship and Idol-Worship in the Old Testament . 289

Rev. Professor Kirsopp Lake, D.D.
The Critical Problems of the Epistle to the Philippians . 481

PAGE

Rev. Professor H. R. Mackintosh, D.Phil., D.D.
Studies in Christian Eschatology:
1. The Christian Hope 111
2. Objections on the Threshold 213
3. The Return of Christ 298
4. Death and the Sequel 427
5. Immortality 538

Rev. Professor J. E. McFadyen, D.D.
The Old Testament and the Modern World . . . 1

Rev. Professor D. S. Margoliouth, Litt.D.
The Transmission of the Gospel 61

Rev. J. B. Mayor, Litt.D.
Miscellanea Evangelica 77
Further Remarks in Response to Dr. Abbott's "Miscellanea Evangelica" 382

Rev. Professor Allan Menzies, D.D.
The Epistle to the Galatians 187

Rev. Professor James Moffatt, D.D., Litt.D.
Exegetica 89

Rev. Professor T. V. Moore, D.D.
The Tower-Builder and the King: a Suggested Exposition of Luke xiv. 25–35 519

Rev. Professor W. Morgan, D.D.
Religion and Philosophy 440

Professor A. S. Peake, D.D.
Professor S. R. Driver 385

Rev. Professor C. Anderson Scott, D.D.
The Early Date of "Galatians": a Reply . . . 182

Rev. Professor Alex. Souter, Litt.D.
The Pastoral Epistles:
Titus. 73
The Identity of the "Ambrosiaster": a Fresh Suggestion 224

Rev. R. H. Strachan, M.A.
The Appendix to the Fourth Gospel 255

Rev. W. L. Walker, D.D.
The Eternal Love and Christian Unity 244

Rev. T. H. Weir, M.A.
Some Fresh Notes on the Text of the Old Testament . 472

Rev. Professor Newport J. D. White, D.D.
Not Peace, but a Sword 465

Rev. E. W. Winstanley, D.D.
Conduct and the Kingdom 346

INDEX TO SUBJECTS.

PAGE

A Study in 1 Corinthians xv. . 174
Abbott's "Miscellanea Evangelica," Further Remarks in Response to Dr. 382
Acts and the Synoptic Gospels, Harnack on the Dates of the 193
"Ambrosiaster": a Fresh Suggestion, The Identity of the . 224
Apocalypse iii. 17, Some Remarks on the Text of 160
Apostolic Degree against Πορνεία, The 40
Appendix to the Fourth Gospel, The 255
Call of God, The 365
Conduct and the Kingdom . . 346
Christ in Prayer, The Example of 494
Christian Eschatology, Studies in 111, 213, 298, 427, 538
Christianity before the Gospel . 401
Critical Problems of the Epistle to the Philippians 481
Criticism, New Points of View in Textual 316
David's 'Capture' of the Jebusite 'Citadel' of Zion . . . 29
Discipline in Prayer 126
Driver, Professor S. R. . . . 385
Epistle to the Galatians, The . 137
Epistles, The Pastoral 73
Eschatology, Studies in Christian 111, 213, 298, 427, 538
Evangelica, Miscellanea 77, 166, 382
Eye, The "Single" 275
Exegetica 89
Fourth Gospel, Notes on the 148, 233, 335, 453, 558
Fourth Gospel, The Appendix to the 255
Galatians, The Epistle to the . 137
"Galatians": a Reply, The Early Date of 183
God, The Call of 365
Gospel, The Transmission of the 61

PAGE

Gospels, Christianity before the. 401
Harnack on the Dates of the Acts and the Synoptic Gospels 193
"Heavenly Man," St. Paul and the Conception of the . . . 97
Image-Worship and Idol-worship in the Old Testament . . . 289
Kingdom, Conduct and the . . 346
Love and Christian Unity, The Eternal 244
Miscellanea Evangelica 77, 166, 382
Not Peace but a Sword . . . 465
Old Testament and the Modern World, The 1
Old Testament, Image-worship and Idol-worship in the . . 289
Old Testament, Some Fresh Notes on the Text of the . . 472
Parable of the Prodigal Son . . 552
Pastoral Epistles, The 73
Paul and the Conception of the "Heavenly Man," St. . . . 97
Philippians, The Critical Problems of the Epistle to the . . . 481
Philosophy, Religion and . . . 440
Prayer, Discipline in 126
Prayer, The Example of Christ in 494
Religion and Philosophy . . . 440
Son, The Parable of the Prodigal. 552
Testament, Some Fresh Notes on the Text of the 472
Testament and the Modern World, The Old 1
Textual Criticism, New Points of View in 316
Timothy i., On Two Points in 1. 377
'Thankworthy' Goodness . . 502
Titus 73
Tower-Builder and the King, The 519
Transmission of the Gospel, The . 61
Unity, The Eternal Love and Christian 244
Words "Witch" and "Witchcraft," The 19

INDEX TO TEXTS.

	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
Gen. i. 1	292	Exod. iii. 6	293	Deut. xviii. 10	20
i. 26	100	xx. 4	289	xxvii. 26	141
ii. 7	100	xxi. 17	70	Judges vi. 2	32
xii. 6.	140	xxii. 18	20	1 Sam. i. 9	472
xvi. 12	477	Lev. xvii. 10–14	54	x. 2	473
xviii. 5	36	xviii. 5	141	xi. 7	473
xxi. 10	144	xix. 26	20	xv. 23.	24
xxiii. 8–16	280	xxiv. 16	70	xxii. 1, 4, 5	31
xli. 45	291	Deut. xiv. 1	504	xxiii. 14	32

	PAGE
1 Sam. xxviii.	23
2 Sam. i. 21	473
iii. 12	473
v. 6–9	29
xvi. 5	473
xxi. 1–6	37
1 Kings xiv. 16	294
2 Kings ix. 22.	24
x. 11.	80
1 Chron. viii. 33	35
xi. 4–7	29
2 Chron. xx. 21	496
Ps. vi. 2	475
xxi. 1	478
xxii. 1	64
xxiii. 5.	475
xxxi. 11	80
xlii. 8	38
xlix. 5	475
li. 2	475
lv. 13	80, 171
lxvi. 7	475
lxxxv. 8	130
xci.	31
xci. 11	62
cv. 24	475
cxxxvi.	510
cxliii. 2	140
cxliv. 12	475
Prov. iii. 8.	71
xx. 27	282
xxx. 31	476
Isa. xxi, 16	473
xxvi. 19	258
xxviii. 16.	473
xxxiii. 16.	413
xxxiv. 8	473
xlii. 2	61
liv. 1	144
Jer. xlvi. 9	474
Ezek. vii. 14	477
Amos iv. 3	474
Zech. i. 21	474
iv. 12	38
xi. 3	474
xi. 13	62
xiii. 6	474
xiv. 3	474
Matt. iv. 23	346
v. 20	362
v. 39.	89, 192
v. 43–48.	502
vi. 7	133
vi. 19–34	277
vi. 34	65
x. 34.	465
xi. 25–27	462
xii. 19	61
xiii. 15	62
xvi. 17	234
Matt. xviii. 6	68
xx. 1–16	506
xxii. 29–33	548
xxiii. 37–39	239
xxvi. 7	72
xxvi. 33–35	266
xxvi. 37	77
xxvi. 39	520
xxvi. 53	494
Mark i. 14	344
i. 15	348
iii. 22–30	286
iv. 26–28	299
vi. 40	89, 192
vi. 45	455
vii. 1	456
xii. 41	67
xiv. 2	241
xiv. 3	72
xiv. 27	266
xiv. 45	168
xv. 34	65
Luke ii. 44	79
vi. 12	498
ix. 18	498
ix. 54	241
ix. 57–62	525
x. 38–42.	239
xii. 13	284
xiv. 12–14	280
xiv. 25–35	519
xv. 11	552
xxii. 44	90
xxii. 48	170
xxiii. 34.	92, 331
John i. 1–18	152
i. 12	248
i. 19–34	158
i. 35–51	233
i. 39	78
ii. 1–12	235
ii. 13–25	236
ii. 19–22	242
ii. 23–25	537
iii. 1, 2	335
iv. 22–36	339
iv. 1–42	340
iv. 43–54	343
v. 28, 29	257
vi. 39	256, 261
xiii. 21	78
xiv. 1–3	259
xiv. 1	256
xiv. 2	269
xiv. 28	177
xvii. 15	499
xviii. 5	82
xviii. 12	77
xxi. 1–14	262
xxi. 15–18	265
John xxi. 23	256
Acts i. 1	197
i. 8	198
x. 13.	87
xi. 26	406
xv. 1	185
xv. 20	40
xv. 28	59
xv. 29	424
xv. 38	46
xvi. 4	52
xvi. 25	93
xx. 6	209
xx. 25	195, 204
xx. 35	412
xxi. 15	237
xxi. 24–26	44
xxiv. 24	206
xxviii. 30	196
Rom. i. 19.	79
ii. 15	314
v. 12–21	98
viii. 38	58
xiii. 13	94
xiv. 3, 6.	56
1 Cor. ii. 11	282
vi. 13–20	57
ix. 20	417
x. 8	59
x. 20	53
xi. 10	94
xiii. 1–3	250
xv.	174
xv. 47	103
2 Cor. ii. 17	95
iv. 17. 18	123, 279
v. 17	104
Gal. i. 21	41
ii. 1–10	41, 43
iv. 30	326
v. 20	24
Eph. i. 4	246
iv. 16	250
v. 18	95
v. 25–32	58
v. 26	96
Col. i. 17	109
iii. 2	279
iv. 10	414
1 Thess. i. 10	119
iv. 12	161
1 Tim. i. 3, 5	379
i. 11, 12	277
2 Tim. iv. 13	195
Heb. xiii. 17	96
James i. 5	279, 505
1 Pet. ii. 25	266
Rev. i. 10	209
ii. 24	42

Butler & Tanner, The Selwood Printing Works, Frome, and London.

THIS B

CBPac

Ser 8
v. 7
1914

Expositor

MAY 27 '80

T:4TL1
v.7
1914
Ser.8